arXiv:1602.06383v2 [math.ST] 20 Apr 2016

Testing hypotheses about mixture distributions using not identically distributed data

Daniel Gaigall

Department of Mathematics, Heinrich-Heine-University Düsseldorf, Universitätsstr. 1, 40225 Düsseldorf, Germany.

Abstract

Testing hypotheses of goodness-of-fit about mixture distributions on the basis of independent but not necessarily identically distributed random vectors is considered. The hypotheses are given by a specific distribution or by a family of distributions. Moreover, testing hypotheses formulated by Hadamard differentiable functionals is discussed in this situation, in particular the hypothesis of central symmetry, homogeneity and independence. Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises type statistics are suggested as well as methods to determine critical values. The focus of the investigation is on asymptotic properties of the test statistics. Further, outcomes of simulations for finite sample sizes are given. Applications to models with not identically distributed errors are presented. The results imply that the tests are of asymptotically exact size and consistent.

Keywords: not identically distributed observations, mixture distribution, Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic, Cramér-von-Mises statistic, empirical process, Vapnik-Červonenkis class, Hadamard differentiability

2000 MSC: 62G10, 62G09

1 Introduction

Not identically distributed errors are discussed in various theoretical and practical contexts, see, e.g., the works of Lu et al. [21], Kuljus and Zwanzig [20], Görnitz et al. [14], Eiker [13] and Delaigle and Meister [11]. Consider here the following situation as a motivation. Suppose independent and identically distributed data are underlying, where an independent but not identically distributed noise is present. It is assumed that the difference in the distribution of the noise vanishes if the number of observations increases. The interesting statistical problem is a testing problem of goodness-of-fit formulated with the independent and identically distributed original data.

More precisely, consider a sequence of independent and identically distributed real valued random variables $Y_1, Y_2, \ldots$ with unknown underlying distribution $\mathcal{L}(Y_1)$. Suppose the user has to treat the testing problem of goodness-of-fit

$$\mathrm{H} : \mathcal{L}(Y_1) = \mathcal{L}(Y_0), \ \mathrm{K} : \mathcal{L}(Y_1) \neq \mathcal{L}(Y_0), \tag{1.1}$$

where Y_0 is a real valued random variable with known distribution $\mathcal{L}(Y_0)$. Furthermore, let $Z_1, Z_2, \ldots$ be another sequence of independent but not necessarily identically distributed real

Email adress: Daniel.Gaigall@uni-duesseldorf.de

valued random variables with known distributions such that the convergence in distribution

$$Z_i \xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}} Z \text{ as } i \to \infty$$

holds, with a real valued random variable Z. Assume $Y_1, Y_2, \ldots$ and $Z_1, Z_2, \ldots$ are independent. In addition, a sequence of known and measurable maps $e_i : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, is given and fulfills the convergence

$$\forall z \in \mathbb{R} : \lim_{i \to \infty} e_i(\cdot, z) = e(\cdot, z) \text{ uniformly on } \mathbb{R},$$

where $e : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable map. E.g.,

$$e_i(y, z) = e(y, z) = y + z, \ (y, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}, \ i \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{1.2}$$

Suppose the user cannot observe directly $Y_1, Y_2, \ldots$, but observes

$$e_1(Y_1, Z_1), e_2(Y_2, Z_2), \ldots,$$

i.e., $e_i(\cdot, Z_i)$ represents a random noise in measurement $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, the user has to treat testing problem (1.1) on the basis of the independent but not necessarily identically distributed data $X_1, \ldots, X_n$,

$$X_i := e_i(Y_i, Z_i), \ i \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is a given sample size. In example (1.2),

$$X_i = Y_i + Z_i, \ i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Denote by F_i the distribution function of $X_i = e_i(Y_i, Z_i)$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and by F the distribution function of $e(Y_1, Z)$. Let H_i be the distribution function of $e_i(Y_0, Z_i)$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and let G be the distribution function of $e(Y_0, Z)$. Assume that for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$, the map $e(\cdot, z)$ is injective. Then, testing problem (1.1) is equivalent to

$$\mathrm{H} : F = G, \ \mathrm{K} : F \neq G.$$

Moreover, if the hypothesis H is true, $F_i = H_i$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

In order to get a permutation invariant test statistic, i.e., invariant under transformation of the data from the set

$$\{T_n : \times_{i=1}^n \mathbb{R} \to \times_{i=1}^n \mathbb{R}; T_n(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = (x_{\pi_n(1)}, \ldots, x_{\pi_n(n)}),$$
$$\pi_n : \{1, \ldots, n\} \to \{1, \ldots, n\} \text{ bijective}\},$$

define the arithmetically averaged distribution function

$$\mathbb{F}_n(x) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F_i(x), \ x \in \mathbb{R},$$

based on the distribution functions $F_1, \ldots, F_n$ of $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ and the arithmetically averaged distribution function

$$G_n(x) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H_i(x), \ x \in \mathbb{R},$$

based on the distribution functions $H_1, \ldots, H_n$, the distribution functions of $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ if the hypothesis H is true. Under H, $\mathbb{F}_n = G_n$. Consider the empirical distribution function based on $X_1, \ldots, X_n$,

$$\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{I}(X_i \leqslant x), \ x \in \mathbb{R},$$

and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov type statistic

$$\mathrm{KS}_n := \sqrt{n} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x) - G_n(x)| \tag{1.3}$$

as well as the Cramér-von-Mises type statistic

$$\mathrm{CvM}_n := n \int \big(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x) - G_n(x)\big)^2 G_n(\mathrm{d}x). \tag{1.4}$$

Assume F is continuous. In fact, the test statistics (1.3) and (1.4) can be used to construct asymptotically exact and consistent tests for testing problem (1.1). See the results in Section 2. Note that the distribution function G_n depends on the sample size n and that the test statistics (1.3) and (1.4) are no common Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Cramér-von-Mises statistics. The replacement of G_n with G in the test statistics (1.3) and (1.4), i.e., the common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises statistic, yields no applicable test for testing problem (1.1). This follows easily from the results in Section 2.

In Section 2, testing goodness-of-fit based on not identically distributed data is discussed. In comparison to the situation above the model is more general and the hypothesis is formulated in a more general way. Therefore, generalizations of the test statistics (1.3) and (1.4) are considered and methods to determine critical values are suggested. The tests are applicable, e.g., in the situation presented above. It is shown that the tests are of asymptotically exact size and consistent. Section 3 extends the model in Section 2 to hypotheses of families of distributions. Analogous results are established. Section 4 treats hypotheses formulated by Hadamard differentiable functionals in the same setting. Similar results as in the goodness-of-fit setting hold for a broad class of tests. Special cases are the hypothesis of homogeneity, central symmetry and independence and applications are, e.g., situations with not identically distributed errors. In general, the presented Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Cramér-von-Mises type tests based on not identically distributed data and can be regarded as generalizations of the related Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Cramér-von-Mises type tests in the identically distributed case.

The original Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Cramér-von-Mises statistics are statistics for testing goodness-of-fit, described by Anderson and Darling [2]. The idea of these statistics can be adopted for testing hypothesis of homogeneity, symmetry and independence, see, e.g., Rosenblatt [27], Butler [6] and Blum et al. [5], respectively. An important generalization of the mentioned goodness-of-fit statistics for hypotheses of families of distributions is considered by Stute et al. [33]. Some papers treat other generalizations of Kolmogorov-Smirnov type tests or Cramér-von-Mises type tests. Weiss [39] modified the classical Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic for the application to correlated data. Chicheportiche et al. [8] consider the case of dependent and identically distributed observations and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test as well as the Cramér-von-Mises test. An interesting paper is [7]. The authors Chatterjee and Sen study Kolmogorov-Smirnov type tests for testing the hypothesis of symmetry based on independent but not necessarily identically distributed real valued random variables and investigate the limit distributions of their test statistics with an application of the random walk model.

Further, some works deal with goodness-of-fit tests based on independent but not necessarily identically distributed data. Goodness-of-fit tests in this situation are discussed by Gosh and Basu [15] in a fully parametric setting. These tests use the density power divergence. Testing for normality in a model with independent but not necessarily identically distributed observations is considered by Sarkadi [28]. In the discrete case, Collings et al. [9], Hüsler [17] and Conover et al. [10] treat a goodness-of-fit test for the Poisson assumption, the binomial test and the chi-square goodness-of-fit test, respectively, in the case of independent but not necessarily identically distributed data.

2 Testing goodness-of-fit with hypotheses given by a specific distribution

The following generalization of the model introduced in Section 1 is considered. Let $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ be a sequence of independent but not necessarily identically distributed random vectors with values in $\mathbb{R}^m$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$. The random vector X_i has the distribution function F_i defined on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, with $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^l := [-\infty, \infty]^l$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Henceforth, regard elements of $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^l$ as column vectors. Assume the existence of an uniformly continuous distribution function F defined on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$ with

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} F_i = F \text{ uniformly on } \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m.$$

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the given sample size, let G_n be another distribution function defined on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$ as well as G, where G is uniformly continuous and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} G_n = G \text{ uniformly on } \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m.$$

In addition, let $\alpha_{1,n}, \ldots, \alpha_{n,n}$ be some weights, in particular real numbers, such that

$$\alpha_{i,n} \geqslant 0,\ i = 1, \ldots, n,\ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_{i,n} = 1,\ \lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt{n} \max_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n} \alpha_{i,n} = 0,\ \lim_{n\to\infty} n \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_{i,n}^2 = \kappa \in [1, \infty). \tag{2.1}$$

Consider the mixture distribution function

$$\mathbb{F}_n(x) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_{i,n} F_i(x),\ x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m,$$

based on the distribution functions $F_1, \ldots, F_n$ of $X_1, \ldots, X_n$. Suppose $F_1, \ldots, F_n$ are unknown, G_n and $\alpha_{1,n}, \ldots, \alpha_{n,n}$ are known and that the user has to verify the hypothesis of goodness-of-fit

$$\mathrm{H}_n : \mathbb{F}_n = G_n \tag{2.2}$$

on the basis of the observations $X_1, \ldots, X_n$.

Define the weighted empirical distribution function

$$\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_{i,n} \mathrm{I}(X_i \leqslant x),\ x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m, \tag{2.3}$$

based on $X_1, \ldots, X_n$. For elements $a, b \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$, $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_m)'$, $b = (b_1, \ldots, b_m)'$, let the inequality $a \leqslant b$ be equivalent to $a_j \leqslant b_j$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m$. Further, let $\mathbb{U}_n := (U_n(x); x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ be the process

$$U_n(x) := \sqrt{n}\big(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x) - G_n(x)\big),\ x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m. \tag{2.4}$$

Consider the Kolmogorov-Smirnov type statistic

$$\mathrm{KS}_n := \sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |U_n(x)| = \sqrt{n} \sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x) - G_n(x)| \tag{2.5}$$

and the Cramér-von-Mises type statistic

$$\mathrm{CvM}_n := \int U_n^2(x) G_n(\mathrm{d}x) = n \int \big(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x) - G_n(x)\big)^2 G_n(\mathrm{d}x). \tag{2.6}$$

In general, the statistics (2.5) and (2.6) are not distribution free, neither in the case of $\mathbb{F}_n = G_n$. In order to approximate the distribution of the statistics KS_n and CvM_n if $\mathbb{F}_n = G_n$, a Monte-Carlo procedure is suggested. Therefor, simulate independently observations with joint distribution function

$$(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \longmapsto \prod_{i=1}^{n} G_n(x_i),\ (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \times_{i=1}^{n} \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m.$$

Determine a significance level $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and denote by $c_{n;1-\alpha}$ the $(1-\alpha)$-quantile of the distribution of KS_n and by $d_{n;1-\alpha}$ the $(1-\alpha)$-quantile of the distribution of CvM_n if $(F_1,\ldots,F_n) = (G_n,\ldots,G_n)$. The calculation procedure for practice is described above. Then, testing procedure

$$\text{“Reject } \mathrm{H}_n, \text{ iff } \mathrm{KS}_n \geqslant c_{n;1-\alpha}\text{”} \text{ or testing procedure “Reject } \mathrm{H}_n, \text{ iff } \mathrm{CvM}_n \geqslant d_{n;1-\alpha}\text{”} \quad (2.7)$$

is suggested. If $\alpha_{i,n} = \frac{1}{n}$, $i = 1,\ldots,n$, testing procedure (2.7), in particular the statistic (2.5) or (2.6), is invariant under transformation of the data from the set

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}_n :=& \{T_n : \times_{i=1}^n \mathbb{R}^m \to \times_{i=1}^n \mathbb{R}^m; T_n(x_1,\ldots,x_n) = (x_{\pi_n(1)},\ldots,x_{\pi_n(n)}),\\ & \pi_n : \{1,\ldots,n\} \to \{1,\ldots,n\} \text{ bijective}\}.\end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

Remark 1. *Assume another sequence of known distribution functions $(H_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ defined on $\mathbb{R}^m$ is given and $G_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n} H_i$.*

a) Consider the model introduced in Section 1. Put $\alpha_{i,n} = \frac{1}{n}$, $X_i = e_i(Y_i, Z_i)$ and let H_i be the distribution function of $e_i(Y_0, Z_i)$, $i = 1,\ldots,n$. Then, the test (2.7) is applicable to testing problem (1.1). The test is of asymptotically exact size α and consistent for testing problem (1.1). This follows from the results in this section.

b) The test (2.7) is applicable to the hypothesis

$$\forall i \in \{1,\ldots,n\} : F_i = H_i.$$

Putting $\alpha_{i,n} = \frac{1}{n}$, $i = 1,\ldots,n$, the test (2.7) is also applicable to the hypothesis

$$\exists \pi_n : \{1,\ldots,n\} \to \{1,\ldots,n\} \text{ bijective } \forall i \in \{1,\ldots,n\} : F_i = H_{\pi_n(i)}.$$

The test is of asymptotically exact size α and consistent with respect to suitable alternatives to this hypotheses. See the results in this section.

c) Assume $F_i = F$ and $H_i = G$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Putting $\alpha_{i,n} = \frac{1}{n}$, $i = 1,\ldots,n$, the hypothesis (2.2) is a common hypothesis of goodness-of-fit

$$\mathrm{H} : F = G,$$

the test statistic (2.5) or (2.6) is a common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises statistic and the test (2.7) is a common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises test in a multivariate setting. In this sense, a generalization of the identically distributed case is considered.

Remark 2. *Note that the distribution function G_n depends on the sample size n and that the test statistics (2.5) and (2.6) are no common Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Cramér-von-Mises statistics, neither in the case of $\alpha_{i,n} = \frac{1}{n}$, $i = 1,\ldots,n$. In fact, the replacement of G_n with G in the test statistics (2.5) and (2.6), i.e., the common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises statistic, yields no applicable test for testing problem (2.2). This follows easily from the results in this section.*

2.1 Limit results under the hypothesis

A possible first step to find limit distributions of statistics of type Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Cramér-von-Mises is to show the convergence in distribution of the process in the supremum and integral to a limit element. Let T be a non-empty set and let $\mathbb{W}_n := (W_n(t); t \in T)$ be a stochastic process on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, P)$ with sample paths in

$$\ell^\infty(T) := \{f : T \to \mathbb{R}; ||f||_T < \infty\},$$

where $||f||_T := \sup_{t\in T} |f(t)|$, $f : T \to \mathbb{R}$. The map $(f_1, f_2) \mapsto ||f_1 - f_2||_T$, $(f_1, f_2) \in \ell^\infty(T) \times \ell^\infty(T)$, defines a metric on $\ell^\infty(T)$. Let $\mathbb{W} := (W(t); t \in T)$ be another stochastic

process on the probability space with sample paths in $\ell^\infty(T)$. Then, $\mathbb{W}_n$ converges in distribution to $\mathbb{W}$, in notation $\mathbb{W}_n \xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}} \mathbb{W}$ as $n \to \infty$, iff $\mathbb{W}$ is $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}(\ell^\infty(T))$-measurable and

$$\forall f : \ell^\infty(T) \to \mathbb{R} \text{ continuous and bounded} : \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{E}^*\big(f(\mathbb{W}_n)\big) = \mathrm{E}\big(f(\mathbb{W})\big).$$

$\mathfrak{B}(\ell^\infty(T))$ denotes the Borel σ-field on $(\ell^\infty(T), ||\cdot||_T)$. In addition, E^* is the outer expectation. Details are given by van der Vaart and Wellner [35].

Let ρ be a pseudometric on T such that (T, ρ) is a totally bounded pseudometric space. Then,

$$U_b(T, \rho) := \{f \in \ell^\infty(T); f \text{ is uniformly } \rho\text{-continuous}\}$$

is a separable subspace of $\ell^\infty(T)$. If the process $\mathbb{W}$ has sample paths a.s. in $U_b(T, \rho)$, the process $\mathbb{W}$ is $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}(\ell^\infty(T))$-measurable and the distribution of $\mathbb{W}$ is uniquely determined by its finite dimensional marginal distributions.

The asymptotic equicontinuity is crucial for the convergence in distribution of the process $\mathbb{W}_n$, that is

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 : \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} P^*\left(\sup_{s,t\in T, \rho(s,t)\leqslant\delta} |W_n(s) - W_n(t)| > \varepsilon \right) = 0,$$

where P^* is the outer probability. See [35] for details. Assume the process $\mathbb{W}_n$ is asymptotically equicontinuous and all finite dimensional projections of $\mathbb{W}_n$ converge in distribution to finite dimensional random vectors. Then, there exists a process $\mathbb{W}$ with sample paths a.s. in $U_b(T, \rho)$ such that $\mathbb{W}_n \xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}} \mathbb{W}$ as $n \to \infty$. Particularly, the process $\mathbb{W}$ is $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}(\ell^\infty(T))$-measurable and the distribution of $\mathbb{W}$ is uniquely determined by its finite dimensional marginal distributions, the distributions of those finite dimensional random vectors. See Theorem 1.5.4 in [35].

Now, a triangular array $\xi_{1,n}, \ldots, \xi_{n,n}$ of row-wise independent but not necessarily identically distributed random vectors with values in $\mathbb{R}^m$ on the probability space is given. Let $K_{i,n}$ be the distribution function of $\xi_{i,n}$ defined on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. In the relevant applications, $K_{i,n}$ depends either only on i or only on n, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Assume the existence of an uniformly continuous distribution function K defined on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$ such that

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0\ \exists i_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}\ \exists n_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N},\ i_\varepsilon \leqslant n_\varepsilon,\ \forall i > i_\varepsilon\ \forall n > n_\varepsilon,\ i \leqslant n : \sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |K_{i,n}(x) - K(x)| \leqslant \varepsilon.$$

The interesting process is the weighted empirical process $\mathbb{W}_n$ given by

$$W_n(x) := \sqrt{n}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n} \mathrm{I}(\xi_{i,n} \leqslant x) - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n} P(\xi_{i,n} \leqslant x) \right),\ x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m.$$

Such types of processes, partly special cases, are studied by Shorack [31], Shorack and Wellner [32], Alexander [1], Pollard [23], Ziegler [40] and Kosorok [18], [19]. Let Φ be the distribution function of the m-dimensional standard normal distribution. Define a metric

$$\rho(x, y) := \int |\mathrm{I}(w \leqslant x) - \mathrm{I}(w \leqslant y)| \Phi(\mathrm{d}w),\ x, y \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m. \tag{2.9}$$

In fact, $(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m, \rho)$ is a totally bounded metric space. With the help of the Vapnik-Červonenkis class theory, it can be shown that the following result holds.

Lemma 1. *The process $\mathbb{W}_n$ is asymptotically equicontinuous with respect to the metric space $(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m, \rho)$.*

Now, the basic results under the hypothesis will be formulated. Therefor, let $\mathbb{U} = (U(x); x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ be a Gaussian process with expectation function identically equal to zero, covariance function

$$c(x,y) := \kappa\Big(G\big(\min(x,y)\big) - G(x)G(y)\Big),\ x,y \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m, \tag{2.10}$$

and a.s. uniformly ρ-continuous sample paths. For elements $a, b \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$, $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_m)'$, $b = (b_1, \ldots, b_m)'$, put $\min(a,b) := (\min(a_1,b_1), \ldots, \min(a_m,b_m))'$.

Theorem 1. *Assume $\mathbb{F}_n = G_n$ for n sufficiently large. Then,*

$$\mathbb{U}_n \xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}} \mathbb{U} \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Corollary 1. *Assume $\mathbb{F}_n = G_n$ for n sufficiently large. It is*

$$\mathrm{KS}_n \xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}} \sup_{x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |U(x)| \text{ and } \mathrm{CvM}_n \xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}} \int U^2(x) G(\mathrm{d}x) \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

In order to show that testing procedure (2.7) works asymptotically, it is necessary to study the asymptotic distribution of the statistics (2.5) and (2.6) if $(F_1, \ldots, F_n) = (G_n, \ldots, G_n)$, too. Well, let $X_1^{(n)}, X_2^{(n)}, \ldots$ be a sequence of independent and identically distributed random vectors with underlying distribution function G_n and let $\mathbb{U}_n^{(n)} = (U_n^{(n)}(x); x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ be the process (2.4) based on the random vectors $X_1^{(n)}, \ldots, X_n^{(n)}$. Denote by $\mathrm{KS}_n^{(n)}$ and $\mathrm{CvM}_n^{(n)}$ the statistics (2.5) and (2.6) based on the random vectors $X_1^{(n)}, \ldots, X_n^{(n)}$, respectively.

Theorem 2. *It is*

$$\mathbb{U}_n^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}} \mathbb{U} \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Corollary 2. *It follows that*

$$\mathrm{KS}_n^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}} \sup_{x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |U(x)| \text{ and } \mathrm{CvM}_n^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}} \int U^2(x) G(\mathrm{d}x) \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

The following result implies that the test (2.7) is a test of asymptotically exact size α.

Corollary 3. *Suppose $\mathbb{F}_n = G_n$ for n sufficiently large. Then,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\mathrm{KS}_n \geqslant c_{n;1-\alpha}) = \alpha \text{ and } \lim_{n\to\infty} P(\mathrm{CvM}_n \geqslant d_{n;1-\alpha}) = \alpha.$$

2.2 Limit results under alternatives

Now, a general result gives the limit behavior in probability of the test statistics (2.5) and (2.6). The result holds under the hypotheses as well as under alternatives.

Theorem 3. *It is*

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 : P\bigg(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\mathrm{KS}_n \geqslant \sup_{x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |F(x) - G(x)| - \varepsilon + o_p(1)\bigg) \longrightarrow 1 \text{ as } n \to \infty,$$

and

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 : P\bigg(\frac{1}{n}\mathrm{CvM}_n \geqslant \int \big(F(x) - G(x)\big)^2 G(\mathrm{d}x) - \varepsilon + o_p(1)\bigg) \longrightarrow 1 \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

The following corollary gives information about the consistency of the test (2.7).

Corollary 4. *Suppose $F - G$ does not vanish everywhere or G-almost everywhere. Then,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\mathrm{KS}_n \geqslant c_{n;1-\alpha}) = 1 \text{ or } \lim_{n\to\infty} P(\mathrm{CvM}_n \geqslant d_{n;1-\alpha}) = 1.$$

3 Testing goodness-of-fit with hypotheses given by a family of distributions

In this section, the model introduced in Section 2 will be extended by adding a parameter. Under regularity conditions, all results still hold in this model. Regard the definitions at the beginning of Section 2. For $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and a given non-empty set $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, maps $G_n : \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m \times \Theta \to \mathbb{R}$ and $G : \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m \times \Theta \to \mathbb{R}$ are given such that for all $\vartheta \in \Theta$ $G_n(\cdot, \vartheta)$ and $G(\cdot, \vartheta)$ are distribution functions, $G(\cdot, \vartheta)$ is uniformly continuous and

$$\forall \vartheta \in \Theta : \lim_{n\to\infty} G_n(\cdot, \vartheta) = G(\cdot, \vartheta) \text{ uniformly on } \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m.$$

Suppose $F_1, \ldots, F_n$ are unknown, G_n and $\alpha_{1,n}, \ldots, \alpha_{n,n}$ are known and that the user has to verify the hypothesis of goodness-of-fit

$$\mathrm{H}_n : \exists \vartheta \in \Theta : \mathbb{F}_n = G_n(\cdot, \vartheta) \tag{3.1}$$

on the basis of the observations $X_1, \ldots, X_n$.

Define a process $\mathbb{U}_n(\vartheta) := (U_n(x, \vartheta); x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ by

$$U_n(x, \vartheta) := \sqrt{n}\big(\mathbb{F}_n(x) - G_n(x, \vartheta)\big), \ x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m. \tag{3.2}$$

Further, let t_n be a $(\otimes_{j=1}^n \mathfrak{B}^m, \mathfrak{B}_\Theta^d)$-measurable map $t_n : \times_{j=1}^n \mathbb{R}^m \to \Theta$ and put $\hat{\vartheta}_n := t_n(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$. $\mathfrak{B}^m$ denotes the Borel σ-field on $\mathbb{R}^m$ and $\mathfrak{B}_\Theta^d$ denotes the Borel σ-field on $\mathbb{R}^d$ restricted on Θ. Consider the Kolmogorov-Smirnov type statistic

$$\mathrm{KS}_n := \sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |U_n(x, \hat{\vartheta}_n)| = \sqrt{n} \sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |\mathbb{F}_n(x) - G_n(x, \hat{\vartheta}_n)| \tag{3.3}$$

and the Cramér-von-Mises type statistic

$$\mathrm{CvM}_n := \int U_n^2(x, \hat{\vartheta}_n) G_n(\mathrm{d}x, \hat{\vartheta}_n) = n \int \big(\mathbb{F}_n(x) - G_n(x, \hat{\vartheta}_n)\big)^2 G_n(\mathrm{d}x, \hat{\vartheta}_n). \tag{3.4}$$

In general, the statistics (3.3) and (3.4) are not distribution free, neither in the case of the existence of a $\vartheta \in \Theta$ with $\mathbb{F}_n = G_n(\cdot, \vartheta)$. In order to approximate the distribution of the statistics KS_n and CvM_n if the existence of a $\vartheta \in \Theta$ with $\mathbb{F}_n = G_n(\cdot, \vartheta)$ is fulfilled, a Monte-Carlo procedure is suggested. Therefor, simulate independently observations with joint distribution function

$$(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \longmapsto \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{G}_n(x_i, \hat{\vartheta}_n), \ (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \times_{i=1}^n \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m.$$

Determine a significance level $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and denote by $c_{n;1-\alpha}$ the $(1-\alpha)$-quantile of the distribution of KS_n and by $d_{n;1-\alpha}$ the $(1-\alpha)$-quantile of the distribution of CvM_n if $(F_1, \ldots, F_n) = (G_n(\cdot, \hat{\vartheta}_n), \ldots, G_n(\cdot, \hat{\vartheta}_n))$. The calculation procedure for practice is described above. The testing procedure

$$\text{“Reject } \mathrm{H}_n, \text{ iff } \mathrm{KS}_n \geqslant c_{n;1-\alpha}\text{”} \text{ or testing procedure “Reject } \mathrm{H}_n, \text{ iff } \mathrm{CvM}_n \geqslant d_{n;1-\alpha}\text{”} \tag{3.5}$$

is suggested.

Remark 3. *Assume another sequence of known maps $H_i : \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m \times \Theta \to \mathbb{R}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, is given such that for all $\vartheta \in \Theta$ $H_i(\cdot, \vartheta)$ is a distribution function and $G_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n} H_i$.*

a) Extend the model introduced in Section 1 in the following way. Assume the hypothesis is given by a family of distributions $\{\mathcal{L}(Y_0, \vartheta_1); \vartheta_1 \in \Theta_1\}$, with a non-empty set $\Theta_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$, $d_1 \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e., the user has to treat the testing problem of goodness-of-fit

$$\mathrm{H} : \exists \vartheta_1 \in \Theta_1 : \mathcal{L}(Y_1) = \mathcal{L}(Y_0, \vartheta_1), \ \mathrm{K} : \forall \vartheta_1 \in \Theta_1 : \mathcal{L}(Y_1) \neq \mathcal{L}(Y_0, \vartheta_1).$$

In addition, suppose the error variables $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ *come from families of distributions* $\{(\mathcal{L}(Z_i,\vartheta_2))_{i\in\mathbb{N}};\vartheta_2\in\Theta_2\}$, $i\in\mathbb{N}$, *with a non-empty set* $\Theta_2\subset\mathbb{R}^{d_2}$, $d_2\in\mathbb{N}$, *and that the true parameter* $\vartheta_2\in\Theta_2$ *is unknown. Moreover, assume the error functions* $(e_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ *come from families of functions* $\{(e_i(\cdot,\vartheta_3))_{i\in\mathbb{N}};\vartheta_3\in\Theta_3\}$, $i\in\mathbb{N}$, *with a non-empty set* $\Theta_3\subset\mathbb{R}^{d_3}$, $d_3\in\mathbb{N}$, *and that the true parameter* $\vartheta_3\in\Theta_3$ *is unknown, too. Put* $d=d_1+d_2+d_3$, $\Theta=\{(\vartheta_1',\vartheta_2',\vartheta_3')';(\vartheta_1,\vartheta_2,\vartheta_3)\in\Theta_1\times\Theta_2\times\Theta_3\}$, $\alpha_{i,n}=\frac{1}{n}$, $X_i=e_i((Y_i,Z_i),\vartheta_3)$ *and let* H_i *be the distribution function of* $e_i((Y_0,Z_i,\vartheta_3))$, $i=1,\dots,n$, *where* $\vartheta_3\in\Theta_3$ *is the true parameter. Then, the test (3.5) is applicable to this testing problem. Under regularity conditions, it follows from the results in this section that the test is of asymptotically exact size* α *and consistent.*

b) *The test (3.5) is applicable to the hypothesis*

$$\exists\vartheta\in\Theta\ \forall i\in\{1,\dots,n\}:F_i=H_i(\cdot,\vartheta).$$

Putting $\alpha_{i,n}=\frac{1}{n}$, $i=1,\dots,n$, *the test (3.5) is also applicable to the hypothesis*

$$\exists\vartheta\in\Theta\ \exists\pi_n:\{1,\dots,n\}\to\{1,\dots,n\}\ \text{bijective}\ \forall i\in\{1,\dots,n\}:F_i=H_{\pi_n(i)}(\cdot,\vartheta).$$

Under regularity conditions, it follows from the results in this section that the test is of asymptotically exact size α *and consistent with respect to suitable alternatives to this hypotheses.*

c) *Assume* $F_i=F$ *and* $H_i=G$, $i\in\mathbb{N}$. *Putting* $\alpha_{i,n}=\frac{1}{n}$, $i=1,\dots,n$, *the hypothesis (3.1) is a common hypothesis of goodness-of-fit with families of distributions*

$$\mathrm{H}:\exists\vartheta\in\Theta:F=G(\cdot,\vartheta),$$

the test statistic (3.3) or (3.4) is a common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises statistic with estimated parameter and the test (3.5) is a common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises test with families of distributions in a multivariate setting. In this sense, a generalization of the identically distributed case is considered.

Remark 4. *Note that the distribution function* G_n *depends on the sample size* n *and that the test statistics (3.3) and (3.4) are no common Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Cramér-von-Mises statisticswith estimated parameter, neither in the case of* $\alpha_{i,n}=\frac{1}{n}$, $i=1,\dots,n$. *In fact, the replacement of* G_n *with* G *in the test statistics (3.3) and (3.4), i.e., the common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises statistic, yields no applicable test for testing problem (3.1). This follows easily from the results in this section.*

3.1 Limit results under the hypothesis

Fix a parameter $\vartheta\in\Theta$. In order to establish the results of Section 2 to this model, some technical assumptions are required. The first two are regularity conditions to the families of distributions given by the hypothesis.

(C1) There exists an open and convex set $U_\vartheta\subset\Theta$ such that $\vartheta\in U_\vartheta$ and for all $x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$ $G_n(x,\cdot):\Theta\to\mathbb{R}$ is continuous differentiable on U_ϑ.

Define $g_n(x,\tilde{\vartheta}):=\nabla G_n(x,\tilde{\vartheta})$, $(x,\tilde{\vartheta})\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m\times U_\vartheta$, where $\nabla:=(\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{\vartheta}_1},\dots,\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{\vartheta}_d})'$.

(C2) There exists a map $g:\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m\times U_\vartheta\to\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty}g_n=g$ uniformly on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m\times U_\vartheta$, g is uniformly continuous on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m\times U_\vartheta$ and $g(\cdot,\vartheta):\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m\to\mathbb{R}^d$ has bounded components on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$.

Now, a regularity condition to the parameter estimator is formulated. Particular, an asymptotic expansion is needed. The condition is fulfilled, e.g., for a weighted maximum-likelihood estimator, see Remark 5.

(C3) If $\mathbb{F}_n = G_n(\cdot,\vartheta)$ for n sufficiently large, there exists a $(\mathfrak{B}^m,\mathfrak{B}^d)$-measurable map $\ell_n(\cdot,\vartheta):\mathbb{R}^m\to\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\int \ell_n(x,\vartheta)F_i(\mathrm{d}x)$ and $\int \ell_n(x,\vartheta)\ell_n'(x,\vartheta)F_i(\mathrm{d}x)$ exist and have finite components for $i=1,\ldots,n$, $\int \ell_n(x,\vartheta)\mathbb{F}_n(\mathrm{d}x)=0$ and

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\vartheta}_n-\vartheta)=\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\ell_n(X_i,\vartheta)+o_p(1) \text{ as } n\to\infty.$$

Put

$$v_{i,n}(\vartheta):=\int\Big(\ell_n(x,\vartheta)-\int\ell_n(y,\vartheta)F_i(\mathrm{d}y)\Big)\Big(\ell_n(x,\vartheta)-\int\ell_n(y,\vartheta)F_i(\mathrm{d}y)\Big)'F_i(\mathrm{d}x),\ i\in\mathbb{N},$$

and

$$w_{i,n}(y,\vartheta):=\int\ell_n(x,\vartheta)\mathrm{I}(x\leqslant y)F_i(\mathrm{d}x)-\int\ell_n(x,\vartheta)F_i(\mathrm{d}x)F_i(y),\ y\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m,\ i\in\mathbb{N}.$$

The following condition guarantees the convergence of the covariance function of the process $\mathbb{U}_n(\vartheta)$ and that Lindeberg's condition is fulfilled.

(C4) If $\mathbb{F}_n=G_n(\cdot,\vartheta)$ for n sufficiently large, there exists a $v(\vartheta)\in\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ and a $w(\cdot,\vartheta):\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m\to\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} n\sum_{i=1}^n\alpha_{i,n}^2 v_{i,n}(\vartheta)=\kappa v(\vartheta)$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} n\sum_{i=1}^n\alpha_{i,n}^2 w_{i,n}(x,\vartheta)=\kappa w(x,\vartheta)$ for all $x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$. Well, if $\mathbb{F}_n=G_n(\cdot,\vartheta)$ for n sufficiently large,

$$\begin{aligned}\forall a\in\mathbb{R}^d\ \forall t>0:\lim_{n\to\infty} n\sum_{i=1}^n\alpha_{i,n}^2\int\Big(1+a'\Big(\ell_n(x,\vartheta)-\int\ell_n(y,\vartheta)F_i(\mathrm{d}y)\Big)\\ \Big(\ell_n(x,\vartheta)-\int\ell_n(y,\vartheta)F_i(\mathrm{d}y)\Big)'a\Big)\\ \mathrm{I}\Big((\sqrt{n}\max_{1\leqslant j\leqslant n}\alpha_{j,n})^2a'\Big(\ell_n(x,\vartheta)-\int\ell_n(y,\vartheta)F_i(\mathrm{d}y)\Big)\\ \Big(\ell_n(x,\vartheta)-\int\ell_n(y,\vartheta)F_i(\mathrm{d}y)\Big)'a>t\Big)F_i(\mathrm{d}x)=0.\end{aligned}$$

Ignore the $o_P(1)$ term in (C3). Then, the estimator $\hat{\vartheta}_n$ is invariant under transformation of the data from the set $\mathcal{T}_n$ if (C3) holds and $\alpha_{i,n}=\frac{1}{n}$, $i=1,\ldots,n$, and testing procedure (3.5), in particular the statistic (3.3) or (3.4), has this invariance property, too.

The following lemma shows the weak consistency of the parameter estimator.

Lemma 2. *Assume $\mathbb{F}_n=G_n(\cdot,\vartheta)$ for n sufficiently large and (C1) - (C4). Then, $\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\alpha_{i,n}(\ell_n(X_i,\vartheta)-\int\ell_n(x,\vartheta)F_i(\mathrm{d}x))$ converges in distribution to a centered d-dimensional normal distribution as $n\to\infty$ and*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\hat{\vartheta}_n=\vartheta \text{ in probability.}$$

Now, the basic results under the hypothesis will be formulated. Therefor, let $\mathbb{U}(\vartheta)=(U(x,\vartheta);x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ be a Gaussian process with expectation function identically equal to zero, covariance function

$$\begin{aligned}c(x,y,\vartheta):=&\kappa\Big(G\big(\min(x,y),\vartheta\big)-G(x,\vartheta)G(y,\vartheta)\\ &-g'(x,\vartheta)w(y,\vartheta)-g'(y,\vartheta)w(x,\vartheta)+g'(x,\vartheta)v(\vartheta)g(y,\vartheta)\Big),\ x,y\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m,\end{aligned}\tag{3.6}$$

and a.s. uniformly ρ-continuous sample paths.

Theorem 4. *Assume (C1) - (C4) and $\mathbb{F}_n = G_n(\cdot, \vartheta)$ for n sufficiently large. Then,*

$$\mathbb{U}_n(\hat{\vartheta}_n) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}} \mathbb{U}(\vartheta) \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Corollary 5. *Assume (C1) - (C4) and $\mathbb{F}_n = G_n(\cdot, \vartheta)$ for n sufficiently large. It follows that*

$$\mathrm{KS}_n \xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}} \sup_{x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |U(x, \vartheta)| \text{ and } \mathrm{CvM}_n \xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}} \int U^2(x, \vartheta) G(\mathrm{d}x, \vartheta) \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

In order to show that testing procedure (3.5) works asymptotically, it is necessary to study the asymptotic distribution of the statistics (3.3) and (3.4) if $(F_1, \ldots, F_n) = (G_n(\cdot, \hat{\vartheta}_n), \ldots, G_n(\cdot, \hat{\vartheta}_n))$, too.

Well, let $(\vartheta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an arbitrary sequence of parameters with $\vartheta_n \in \Theta$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lim_{n \to \infty} \vartheta_n = \vartheta$. Further, let $X_1^{(n)}, X_2^{(n)}, \ldots$ be a sequence of independent and identically distributed random vectors with underlying distribution function $\mathbb{G}_n(\cdot, \vartheta_n)$, put $\hat{\vartheta}_n^{(n)} := t_n(X_1^{(n)}, \ldots, X_n^{(n)})$ and let $\mathbb{U}_n^{(n)}(\hat{\vartheta}_n^{(n)}) = (U_n^{(n)}(x, \hat{\vartheta}_n^{(n)}); x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ be the process (3.2) based on the random vectors $X_1^{(n)}, \ldots, X_n^{(n)}$. Denote by $\mathrm{KS}_n^{(n)}$ and $\mathrm{CvM}_n^{(n)}$ the statistics (3.3) and (3.4) based on the random vectors $X_1^{(n)}, \ldots, X_n^{(n)}$, respectively. In addition to the conditions (C1) and (C2), consider the following two conditions. This conditions are modifications of the conditions (C3) and (C4).

(C5) There exists a map $\ell_n : \mathbb{R}^m \times U_\vartheta \to \mathbb{R}^d$ such that for all $\tilde{\vartheta} \in U_\vartheta$ $\ell_n(\cdot, \tilde{\vartheta})$ is $(\mathfrak{B}^m, \mathfrak{B}^d)$-measurable, $\int \ell_n(x, \tilde{\vartheta}) G_n(\mathrm{d}x, \tilde{\vartheta})$ and $\int \ell_n(x, \tilde{\vartheta}) \ell_n'(x, \tilde{\vartheta}) G_n(\mathrm{d}x, \tilde{\vartheta})$ exist and have finite components, $\int \ell_n(x, \tilde{\vartheta}) G_n(\mathrm{d}x, \tilde{\vartheta}) = 0$ and

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\vartheta}_n^{(n)} - \vartheta_n) = \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n} \ell_n(X_i^{(n)}, \vartheta_n) + o_p(1) \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Put

$$v_n^{()}(\tilde{\vartheta}) := \int \ell_n(x, \tilde{\vartheta}) \ell_n'(x, \tilde{\vartheta}) G_n(\mathrm{d}x, \tilde{\vartheta}), \ \tilde{\vartheta} \in U_\vartheta,$$

and

$$w_n^{()}(y, \tilde{\vartheta}) := \int \ell_n(x, \tilde{\vartheta}) \mathrm{I}(x \leqslant y) G_n(\mathrm{d}x, \tilde{\vartheta}), \ y \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m, \ \tilde{\vartheta} \in U_\vartheta.$$

(C6) There exists a $v^{()}(\vartheta) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $\lim_{n \to \infty} v_n^{()}(\vartheta_n) = v^{()}(\vartheta)$. In addition, there exists a map $w^{()}(\cdot, \vartheta) : \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m \to \mathbb{R}^d$ such that for all $x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$ $\lim_{n \to \infty} w_n^{()}(x, \vartheta_n) = w^{()}(x, \vartheta)$. Well,

$$\forall a \in \mathbb{R}^d \ \forall t > 0 : \lim_{n \to \infty} \int \big(1 + a' \ell_n(x, \vartheta_n) \ell_n'(x, \vartheta_n) a\big) \\ \mathrm{I}\big((\sqrt{n} \max_{1 \leqslant j \leqslant n} \alpha_{j,n})^2 a' \ell_n(x, \vartheta_n) \ell_n'(x, \vartheta_n) a > t\big) G_n(\mathrm{d}x, \vartheta_n) = 0.$$

Remark 5. *Under regularity conditions, a weighted maximum-likelihood estimation function t_n fulfills the mentioned conditions. Weighted maximum-likelihood estimators are considered, e.g., by Wang and Zidek [38], Hu and Zidek [16] and Wang, van Eeden and Zidek [37]. Assume $\vartheta \in \Theta$ has the property $\mathbb{F}_n = G_n(\cdot, \vartheta)$ for n sufficiently large. Consider n sufficiently large. Suppose the existence of a density $h_n(\cdot, \tilde{\vartheta})$ of $G_n(\cdot, \tilde{\vartheta})$ for all $\tilde{\vartheta} \in \Theta$ with respect to a dominating σ-finite measure μ on $(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathfrak{B}^m)$ and assume for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ the map $\tilde{\vartheta} \mapsto h_n(x, \tilde{\vartheta})$, $\tilde{\vartheta} \in \Theta$, is two times continuous differentiable. Moreover, let t_n be a weighted maximum-likelihood estimation function for ϑ with the property*

$$\sup_{\tilde{\vartheta} \in \Theta} \prod_{i=1}^n h_n^{\alpha_{i,n}}(x_i, \tilde{\vartheta}) = \prod_{i=1}^n h_n^{\alpha_{i,n}}\big(x_i, t_n(x_1, \ldots, x_n)\big), \ (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \times_{i=1}^n \mathbb{R}^m.$$

Put $L_n(\cdot,\tilde\vartheta) := \log h_n(\cdot,\tilde\vartheta)$. *Assume* $\{y\in\mathbb{R}^m; h_n(y,\tilde\vartheta)>0\}$ *does not depend on* $\tilde\vartheta\in\Theta$ *and* Θ *is open and convex. Taylor expansion yields*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde\vartheta_j}L_n(X_i^{(n)},\tilde\vartheta)_{|_{\tilde\vartheta=\vartheta_n}} + \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\nabla'\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde\vartheta_j}L_n(X_i^{(n)},\tilde\vartheta)_{|_{\tilde\vartheta=\overline{\vartheta}_{j,n}}}\sqrt{n}(\hat\vartheta_n^{(n)}-\vartheta_n)\\ =&\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde\vartheta_j}L_n(X_i^{(n)},\tilde\vartheta)_{|_{\tilde\vartheta=\hat\vartheta_n^{(n)}}},\ j=1,\dots,d,\end{aligned}$$

where $\overline{\vartheta}_{j,n}$ *is on the line between* $\hat\vartheta_n^{(n)}$ *and* ϑ_n *(*$\overline{\vartheta}_{j,n}$ *can be chosen measurable, see Hilfssatz 6.7 of Müller-Funk and Witting [22]),* $j=1,\dots,d$. *This is equivalent to*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\nabla L_n(X_i^{(n)},\tilde\vartheta)_{|_{\tilde\vartheta=\vartheta_n}} + \begin{pmatrix}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\nabla'\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde\vartheta_1}L_n(X_i^{(n)},\tilde\vartheta)_{|_{\tilde\vartheta=\overline{\vartheta}_{1,n}}}\\ \vdots\\ \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\nabla'\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde\vartheta_d}L_n(X_i^{(n)},\tilde\vartheta)_{|_{\tilde\vartheta=\overline{\vartheta}_{d,n}}}\end{pmatrix}\sqrt{n}(\hat\vartheta_n^{(n)}-\vartheta_n)\\ =&\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\nabla L_n(X_i^{(n)},\tilde\vartheta)_{|_{\tilde\vartheta=\hat\vartheta_n^{(n)}}}.\end{aligned}$$

Suppose $\hat\vartheta_n^{(n)}$ *has the property*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\nabla L_n(X_i^{(n)},\tilde\vartheta)_{|_{\tilde\vartheta=\hat\vartheta_n^{(n)}}}=0 \text{ in probability}$$

and assume the existence of a matrix $i(\vartheta_n)\in\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ *such that* $i(\vartheta_n)$ *is invertible and*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\left(\begin{pmatrix}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\nabla'\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde\vartheta_1}L_n(X_i^{(n)},\tilde\vartheta)_{|_{\tilde\vartheta=\overline{\vartheta}_{1,n}}}\\ \vdots\\ \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\nabla'\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde\vartheta_d}L_n(X_i^{(n)},\tilde\vartheta)_{|_{\tilde\vartheta=\overline{\vartheta}_{d,n}}}\end{pmatrix}+i(\vartheta_n)\right)=0 \text{ in probability.}$$

Typically, i *is the Fisher information matrix with respect to the distribution function* $G(\cdot,\tilde\vartheta),\tilde\vartheta\in\Theta$. *Put* $\ell_n(x,\tilde\vartheta) := i^{-1}(\tilde\vartheta)\nabla L_n(x,\tilde\vartheta)$, $(x,\tilde\vartheta)\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m\times\Theta$, *and note that*

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat\vartheta_n^{(n)}-\vartheta_n)=\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\ell_n(X_i^{(n)},\vartheta_n)+o_P(1) \text{ as } n\to\infty.$$

Further, assume for all $\tilde\vartheta\in\Theta$ $\int\ell_n(x,\tilde\vartheta)G_n(\mathrm{d}x,\tilde\vartheta)$ *and* $\int\ell_n(x,\tilde\vartheta)\ell_n'(x,\tilde\vartheta)G_n(\mathrm{d}x,\tilde\vartheta)$ *exist and have finite components and*

$$\int\ell_n(x,\tilde\vartheta)G_n(\mathrm{d}x,\tilde\vartheta)=\int\ell_n(x,\tilde\vartheta)h_n(x,\tilde\vartheta)\mu(\mathrm{d}x)=0 \text{ for all } \tilde\vartheta\in\Theta. \tag{3.7}$$

(3.7) is a typical condition related to maximum-likelihood. Thus, the estimator $\hat\vartheta_n^{(n)}$ *has the structure required in (C5). Now, assume* $P(X_i\in\{y\in\mathbb{R}^m; h_n(y,\tilde\vartheta)>0\})=1$, $i=1,\dots,n$. *Analogous,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde\vartheta_j}L_n(X_i,\tilde\vartheta)_{|_{\tilde\vartheta=\vartheta}} + \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\nabla'\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde\vartheta_j}L_n(X_i,\tilde\vartheta)_{|_{\tilde\vartheta=\overline{\overline{\vartheta}}_{j,n}}}\sqrt{n}(\hat\vartheta_n-\vartheta)\\ =&\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde\vartheta_j}L_n(X_i,\tilde\vartheta)_{|_{\tilde\vartheta=\hat\vartheta_n}},\ j=1,\dots,d,\end{aligned}$$

where $\overline{\overline{\vartheta}}_{j,n}$ *is on the line between* $\hat\vartheta_n$ *and* ϑ, $j=1,\dots,d$, *and*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \nabla L_n(X_i,\tilde\vartheta)_{|_{\tilde\vartheta=\vartheta}} + \begin{pmatrix}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\nabla'\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde\vartheta_1}L_n(X_i,\tilde\vartheta)_{|_{\tilde\vartheta=\overline{\overline{\vartheta}}_{1,n}}}\\ \vdots\\ \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\nabla'\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde\vartheta_d}L_n(X_i,\tilde\vartheta)_{|_{\tilde\vartheta=\overline{\overline{\vartheta}}_{d,n}}}\end{pmatrix}\sqrt{n}(\hat\vartheta_n-\vartheta)\\ =&\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\nabla L_n(X_i,\tilde\vartheta)_{|_{\tilde\vartheta=\hat\vartheta_n}}.\end{aligned}$$

Suppose

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\alpha_{i,n}\nabla L_n(X_i,\tilde{\vartheta})_{|_{\tilde{\vartheta}=\hat{\vartheta}_n}}=0 \text{ in probability}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\begin{pmatrix}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\alpha_{i,n}\nabla'\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{\vartheta}_1}L_n(X_i,\tilde{\vartheta})_{|_{\tilde{\vartheta}=\overline{\overline{\vartheta}}_{1,n}}}\\ \vdots\\ \sum_{i=1}^{n}\alpha_{i,n}\nabla'\frac{\partial}{\partial\tilde{\vartheta}_d}L_n(X_i,\tilde{\vartheta})_{|_{\tilde{\vartheta}=\overline{\overline{\vartheta}}_{d,n}}}\end{pmatrix}=-i(\vartheta) \text{ in probability,}$$

too. Regard that $\mathbb{F}_n=G_n(\cdot,\vartheta)$. *Consequently,*

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\vartheta}_n-\vartheta)=\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\alpha_{i,n}\ell_n(X_i,\vartheta)+o_P(1) \text{ as } n\to\infty.$$

Assume for all $i=1,\dots,n$, $\int\ell_n(x,\vartheta)F_i(\mathrm{d}x)$ *and* $\int\ell_n(x,\vartheta)\ell_n'(x,\vartheta)F_i(\mathrm{d}x)$ *exist and have finite components. In fact,*

$$\int\ell_n(x,\vartheta)\mathbb{F}_n(\mathrm{d}x)=\int\ell_n(x,\vartheta)G_n(\mathrm{d}x,\vartheta)=0.$$

Therefore, the estimator $\hat{\vartheta}_n$ *has the structure required in (C3), too.*

Lemma 3. *Assume (C1), (C2), (C5) and (C6). Then,* $\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\alpha_{i,n}\ell_n(X_i^{(n)},\vartheta_n)$ *converges in distribution to a centered d-dimensional normal distribution as* $n\to\infty$ *and*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\hat{\vartheta}_n^{(n)}=\vartheta \text{ in probability.}$$

Let $\mathbb{U}^{()}(\vartheta)=(U^{()}(x,\vartheta);x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ be a Gaussian process with expectation function identically equal to zero, covariance function

$$\begin{aligned}c^{()}(x,y,\vartheta):=&\kappa\Big(G\big(\min(x,y),\vartheta\big)-G(x,\vartheta)G(y,\vartheta)\\&-g'(x,\vartheta)w^{()}(y,\vartheta)-g'(y,\vartheta)w^{()}(x,\vartheta)+g'(x,\vartheta)v^{()}(\vartheta)g(y,\vartheta)\Big),\ x,y\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m,\end{aligned}\tag{3.8}$$

and a.s. uniformly ρ-continuous sample paths. This process is a modification of the process $\mathbb{U}(\vartheta)$.

Theorem 5. *Assume (C1), (C2), (C5) and (C6). Then,*

$$\mathbb{U}_n^{(n)}(\hat{\vartheta}_n^{(n)})\xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}}\mathbb{U}^{()}(\vartheta) \text{ as } n\to\infty.$$

Corollary 6. *Assume (C1), (C2), (C5) and (C6). Then,*

$$\mathrm{KS}_n^{(n)}\xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}}\sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m}|U^{()}(x,\vartheta)| \text{ and } \mathrm{CvM}_n^{(n)}\xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}}\int\big(U^{()}(x,\vartheta)\big)^2G(\mathrm{d}x,\vartheta) \text{ as } n\to\infty.$$

The following result implies that the test (3.5) is of asymptotically exact size α.

Corollary 7. *Suppose the existence of a* $\vartheta\in\Theta$ *with* $\mathbb{F}_n=G_n(\cdot,\vartheta)$ *for n sufficiently large and (C1) - (C4) hold for this parameter. In addition, assume (C5) and (C6) hold for arbitrary sequences* $(\vartheta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *with* $\vartheta_n\in\Theta$ *for all* $n\in\mathbb{N}$ *and* $\lim_{n\to\infty}\vartheta_n=\vartheta$ *and* $v^{()}(\vartheta)=v(\vartheta)$ *and* $w^{()}(x,\vartheta)=w(x,\vartheta)$ *for all* $x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$. *Moreover, suppose the restriction of the covariance function (3.6) to the diagonal of* $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m\times\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$ *does not vanish everywhere or* $G(\cdot,\vartheta)$*-almost everywhere. Then,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}P(\mathrm{KS}_n\geqslant c_{n;1-\alpha})=\alpha \text{ or } \lim_{n\to\infty}P(\mathrm{CvM}_n\geqslant d_{n;1-\alpha})=\alpha.$$

3.2 Limit results unter alternatives

In order to establish limit results under alternatives, the weak convergence in probability of the parameter estimator is still required. Consider the following condition.

(C7) There exists a $\vartheta \in \Theta$ with $\lim_{n\to\infty} \hat{\vartheta}_n = \vartheta$ in probability.

Theorem 6. *Assume (C7) and the conditions (C1) and (C2) hold for the parameter ϑ given by (C7). Then,*

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 : P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\mathrm{KS}_n \geqslant \sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |F(x) - G(x,\vartheta)| - \varepsilon + o_p(1)\right) \longrightarrow 1 \text{ as } n \to \infty,$$

and

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 : P\left(\frac{1}{n}\mathrm{CvM}_n \geqslant \int \big(F(x) - G(x,\vartheta)\big)^2 G(\mathrm{d}x,\vartheta) - \varepsilon + o_p(1)\right) \longrightarrow 1 \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

The following corollary is useful for consistency considerations with respect to the test (3.5).

Corollary 8. *Assume (C7) and suppose that the conditions (C1) and (C2) hold for the parameter ϑ given by (C7). Moreover, assume for ϑ given by (C7), (C5) and (C6) hold for arbitrary sequences $(\vartheta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $\vartheta_n \in \Theta$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \vartheta_n = \vartheta$. Suppose $F - G(\cdot,\vartheta)$ does not vanish everywhere or $G(\cdot,\vartheta)$-almost everywhere and the restriction of the covariance function (3.8) to the diagonal of $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m \times \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$ does not vanish everywhere or $G(\cdot,\vartheta)$-almost everywhere. Then,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\mathrm{KS}_n \geqslant c_{n;1-\alpha}) = 1 \text{ or } \lim_{n\to\infty} P(\mathrm{CvM}_n \geqslant d_{n;1-\alpha}) = 1.$$

4 Testing hypotheses formulated by Hadamard differentiable functionals

Now, consider a general two sample situation. All results can be simply extended to more than two samples or modified to the one sample case. Regard the definitions at the beginning of Section 2. The second sample comes from a sequence of independent but not necessarily identically distributed $\mathbb{R}^s$-valued random vectors $V_1, V_2, \ldots$, $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ and $V_1, V_2, \ldots$ are independent. For $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let G_i be the distribution function of V_i defined on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s$ and let G be an uniformly continuous distribution function defined on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s$ with

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} G_i = G \text{ uniformly on } \overline{\mathbb{R}}^s.$$

In addition, let $r \in \mathbb{N}$ be a second sample size and assume the sample sizes increasing such that

$$\lim_{\min N\to\infty} \frac{n}{r} = \eta \in (0,\infty), \tag{4.1}$$

where $N := \{n, r\}$. Furthermore, let $\beta_{1,r}, \ldots, \beta_{r,r}$ be some additional weights, in particular real numbers, with

$$\beta_{i,r} \geqslant 0,\ i = 1,\ldots,r,\ \sum_{i=1}^{r} \beta_{i,r} = 1,\ \lim_{r\to\infty} \sqrt{r} \max_{1\leqslant i\leqslant r} \beta_{i,r} = 0,\ \lim_{r\to\infty} r \sum_{i=1}^{r} \beta_{i,r}^2 = \tau \in [1,\infty). \tag{4.2}$$

Define the mixture distribution

$$\mathbb{G}_r(v) := \sum_{i=1}^{r} \beta_{i,r} G_i(v),\ v \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^s,$$

based on the distribution functions $G_1, \dots, G_r$ of $V_1, \dots, V_r$ and the weighted empirical distribution function

$$\hat{\mathbb{G}}_r(v) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_{i,r} \mathrm{I}(V_i \leqslant v), \ v \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^s,$$

based on $V_1, \dots, V_r$

The aim is to formulate a general hypothesis with the help of two functionals. Therefor, denote by $\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^l)$ the set of all distribution functions defined on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^l$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Consider two maps $T : \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \times \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s) \to \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^u)$, $Q : \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \times \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s) \to \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^u)$, $u \in \mathbb{N}$, and assume this maps are continuous with respect to the supremum metrics on $\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^u)$ and $\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \times \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s)$. Suppose $F_1, \dots, F_n$ and $G_1, \dots, G_r$ are unknown, the maps T and Q as well as $\alpha_{1,n}, \dots, \alpha_{n,n}$ and $\beta_{1,r}, \dots, \beta_{r,r}$ are known and that the user has to verify the hypothesis

$$\mathrm{H}_N : T(\mathbb{F}_n, \mathbb{G}_r) = Q(\mathbb{F}_n, \mathbb{G}_r) \tag{4.3}$$

on the basis of the observations $X_1, \dots, X_n$ and $V_1, \dots, V_r$.

Another functional is required for the construction of the testing procedure. Let $j : \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \times \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s) \to \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \times \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s)$ be a continuous map with respect to the supremum metric on $\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \times \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s)$ such that

$$T \circ j = Q \circ j$$

and

$$j(K) = K \text{ for all } K \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \times \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s) \text{ with } T(K) = Q(K).$$

The map j could be a projection on the subspace of $\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \times \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s)$ given by the hypothesis. Define $\hat{\mathbb{J}}_N := j(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n, \hat{\mathbb{G}}_r)$ and write $\hat{\mathbb{J}}_N = (\hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,m}, \hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,s})$, where $\hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,m}$ has realizations in $\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ and $\hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,s}$ has realizations in $\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s)$. Put $J := j(F, G)$ and write $J = (J_m, J_s)$, where $J_m \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ and $J_s \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s)$.

Define a process $\mathbb{U}_N := (U_N(z); z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u)$ by

$$U_N(z) := \sqrt[4]{nr}\big(T(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n, \hat{\mathbb{G}}_r)(z) - Q(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n, \hat{\mathbb{G}}_r)(z)\big), \ z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u, \tag{4.4}$$

and consider the Kolmogorov-Smirnov type statistic

$$\mathrm{KS}_N := \sup_{z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u} |U_N(z)| = \sqrt[4]{nr} \sup_{z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u} \big|T(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n, \hat{\mathbb{G}}_r)(z) - Q(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n, \hat{\mathbb{G}}_r)(z)\big| \tag{4.5}$$

as well as the Cramér-von-Mises type statistic

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{CvM}_N : &= \int U_N^2(z) T(\hat{\mathbb{J}}_N)(\mathrm{d}z) = \int U_N^2(z) Q(\hat{\mathbb{J}}_N)(\mathrm{d}z) \\ &= \sqrt{nr} \int \big(T(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n, \hat{\mathbb{G}}_r)(z) - Q(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n, \hat{\mathbb{G}}_r)(z)\big)^2 T(\hat{\mathbb{J}}_N)(\mathrm{d}z). \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

For simplicity, assume $T(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n, \hat{\mathbb{G}}_r)$, $Q(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n, \hat{\mathbb{G}}_r)$ and $T(\hat{\mathbb{J}}_N)$ are step functions with countable vertices. This guarantees measurability of suprema and integrals in this section.

In general, the statistics (4.5) and (4.6) are not distribution free, neither in the case of $T(\mathbb{F}_n, \mathbb{G}_r) = Q(\mathbb{F}_n, \mathbb{G}_r)$. In order to approximate the distribution of the statistics KS_N and CvM_N if $T(\mathbb{F}_n, \mathbb{G}_r) = Q(\mathbb{F}_n, \mathbb{G}_r)$, a Monte-Carlo procedure is suggested. Therefor, simulate independently observations with joint distribution function

$$\begin{aligned} &\big((x_1, \dots, x_n), (v_1, \dots, v_r)\big) \longmapsto \prod_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,m}(x_i) \prod_{i=1}^{r} \hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,s}(v_i), \\ &\big((x_1, \dots, x_n), (v_1, \dots, v_r)\big) \in \times_{i=1}^{n} \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m \times \times_{i=1}^{r} \overline{\mathbb{R}}^s. \end{aligned}$$

Determine a significance level $\alpha \in (0,1)$. Denote by $c_{N;1-\alpha}$ the $(1-\alpha)$-quantile of the distribution of KS_N and by $d_{N;1-\alpha}$ the $(1-\alpha)$-quantile of the distribution of CvM_N if $(F_1,\dots,F_n) = (\hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,m},\dots,\hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,m})$ and $(G_1,\dots,G_r) = (\hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,s},\dots,\hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,s})$. The calculation procedure for practice is described above. Then, testing procedure

$$\text{“Reject } \mathrm{H}_N, \text{ iff } \mathrm{KS}_N \geqslant c_{N;1-\alpha}\text{”} \text{ or testing procedure “Reject } \mathrm{H}_N, \text{ iff } \mathrm{CvM}_N \geqslant d_{N;1-\alpha}\text{”} \tag{4.7}$$

is suggested. In the case of $\alpha_{i,n} = \frac{1}{n}$, $i = 1,\dots,n$, and $\beta_{i,r} = \frac{1}{r}$, $i = 1,\dots,r$, testing procedure (4.7), in particular the statistic (4.5) or (4.6), is invariant under transformation of the data from the set $\mathcal{T}_{n,m} \times \mathcal{T}_{r,s}$, where $\mathcal{T}_{n,m}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{r,s}$ are defined analogous to (2.8).

4.1 Limit results under the hypothesis

The asymptotic results in this section based on a smoothness condition on the functionals T and Q. Call a map $T : \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \times \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s) \to \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^u)$ uniformly Hadamard differentiable in $K \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \times \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s)$, iff there exists a linear map $\mathrm{d}T(K) : \ell^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \times \ell^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s) \to \ell^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^u)$ such that $\mathrm{d}T(K)$ is continuous with respect to the supremum metrics on $\ell^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^u)$ and $\ell^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \times \ell^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s)$ and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{t_n}\big(T(K_n + t_n L_n) - T(K_n)\big) = \mathrm{d}T(K)(L) \text{ uniformly on } \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u$$

for all sequences $(K_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $K_n \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \times \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} K_n = K$ uniformly on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m \times \overline{\mathbb{R}}^s$, for all sequences $(L_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $L_n \in \ell^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \times \ell^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and the existence of a $L \in \ell^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \times \ell^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s)$ with $\lim_{n\to\infty} L_n = L$ uniformly on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m \times \overline{\mathbb{R}}^s$ and all sequences $(t_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $t_n \in (0,\infty)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} t_n = 0$, where $(K_n + t_n L_n) \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \times \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. $\mathrm{d}T(K)$ is called Hadamard derivative in K. Concepts of differentiability of functionals and applications in statistics are discussed by v. Mises [36], Shapiro [30], van der Vaart [34] and Ren and Sen [24], [25], [26].

In order to determine the limit distribution of the process $\mathbb{U}_N$ under the hypothesis, let $\mathbb{M}_m := (M_m(x); x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ be a Gaussian process with expectation function identically equal to zero, covariance function

$$c_m(x,y) := \kappa\eta\Big(J_m\big(\min(x,y)\big) - J_m(x)J_m(y)\Big),\ x,y \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m,$$

and a.s. uniformly continuous sample paths with respect to the metric ρ on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$ defined in (2.9). In addition, let $\mathbb{M}_s := (M_s(v); v \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^s)$ be a Gaussian process with expectation function identically equal to zero, covariance function

$$c_s(v,w) := \tau\eta\Big(J_s\big(\min(v,w)\big) - J_s(v)J_s(w)\Big),\ v,w \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^s,$$

and a.s. uniformly continuous sample paths with respect to a metric on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s$ defined analogous to the metric ρ in (2.9). Let $\mathbb{M}_m$ and $\mathbb{M}_s$ be independent and put $\mathbb{M} := (\mathbb{M}_m, \mathbb{M}_s)$ and $M = (M_m, M_s)$. Finally, let $\mathbb{U} := (U(z); z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u)$ be a process defined by

$$U(z) := \mathrm{d}T(J)(M)(z) - \mathrm{d}Q(J)(M)(z),\ z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u,$$

if T and Q are uniformly Hadamard differentiable in J with Hadamard derivative $\mathrm{d}T(J)$ and $\mathrm{d}Q(J)$, respectively,

Theorem 7. *Assume $T(\mathbb{F}_n, \mathbb{G}_r) = Q(\mathbb{F}_n, \mathbb{G}_r)$ for $\min N$ sufficiently large. Suppose T and Q are uniformly Hadamard differentiable in (F,G) with Hadamard derivative $\mathrm{d}T(F,G)$ and $\mathrm{d}Q(F,G)$, respectively. Then, $J = (F,G)$ and*

$$\mathbb{U}_N \xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}} \mathbb{U} \text{ as } \min N \to \infty.$$

Corollary 9. *Assume $T(\mathbb{F}_n, \mathbb{G}_r) = Q(\mathbb{F}_n, \mathbb{G}_r)$ for $\min N$ sufficiently large. Suppose T and Q are uniformly Hadamard differentiable in (F, G) with Hadamard derivative $\mathrm{d}T(F, G)$ and $\mathrm{d}Q(F, G)$, respectively. Then,*

$$\mathrm{KS}_N \xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}} \sup_{z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u} |U(z)| \text{ and } \mathrm{CvM}_N \xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}} \int U^2(z) T(F, G)(\mathrm{d}z) \text{ as } \min N \to \infty.$$

In order to show that testing procedure (4.7) works asymptotically, it is necessary to study the asymptotic distribution of the statistics (4.5) and (4.6) if $(F_1, \ldots, F_n) = (\hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,m}, \ldots, \hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,m})$ and $(G_1, \ldots, G_r) = (\hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,s}, \ldots, \hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,s})$, too.

Well, for an arbitrary $J_N \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \times \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s)$ with $T(J_N) = Q(J_N)$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} J_N = J$ uniformly on $\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \times \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s)$, $J_N = (J_{N,m}, J_{N,s})$, $J_{N,m} \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$, $J_{N,s} \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s)$, let $X_1^{(N)}, X_2^{(N)}, \ldots$ be a sequence of independent and identically distributed random vectors with underlying distribution function $J_{N,m}$ and let $V_1^{(N)}, V_2^{(N)}, \ldots$ be a sequence of independent and identically distributed random vectors with underlying distribution function $J_{N,s}$. Assume that $X_1^{(N)}, X_2^{(N)}, \ldots$ and $V_1^{(N)}, V_2^{(N)}, \ldots$ are independent. In addition, let $\mathbb{U}_N^{(N)} = (U_N^{(N)}(z); z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u)$ be the process (4.4) based on the random vectors $X_1^{(N)}, \ldots, X_n^{(N)}$ and $V_1^{(N)}, \ldots, V_r^{(N)}$ and denote by $\mathrm{KS}_N^{(N)}$ and $\mathrm{CvM}_N^{(N)}$ the statistics (4.5) and (4.6) based on this random vectors.

Theorem 8. *Suppose T and Q are uniformly Hadamard differentiable in J with Hadamard derivative $\mathrm{d}T(J)$ and $\mathrm{d}Q(J)$, respectively. Assume J is uniformly continuous. Then,*

$$\mathbb{U}_N^{(N)} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}} \mathbb{U} \text{ as } \min N \to \infty.$$

Corollary 10. *Suppose T and Q are uniformly Hadamard differentiable in J with Hadamard derivative $\mathrm{d}T(J)$ and $\mathrm{d}Q(J)$, respectively. Assume J is uniformly continuous. Then,*

$$\mathrm{KS}_N^{(N)} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}} \sup_{z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u} |U(z)| \text{ and } \mathrm{CvM}_N^{(N)} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}} \int U^2(z) T(J)(\mathrm{d}z) \text{ as } \min N \to \infty.$$

The following result implies that the test (4.7) is a test of asymptotically exact size α.

Corollary 11. *Assume $T(\mathbb{F}_n, \mathbb{G}_r) = Q(\mathbb{F}_n, \mathbb{G}_r)$ for $\min N$ sufficiently large. Suppose T and Q are uniformly Hadamard differentiable in (F, G) with Hadamard derivative $\mathrm{d}T(F, G)$ and $\mathrm{d}Q(F, G)$, respectively, and the distribution function of $\sup_{z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u} |U(z)|$ or $\int U^2(z) T(F, G)(\mathrm{d}z)$ is strictly increasing on the non-negative half-line. Then,*

$$\lim_{\min N \to \infty} P(\mathrm{KS}_N \geqslant c_{N;1-\alpha}) = \alpha \text{ or } \lim_{\min N \to \infty} P(\mathrm{CvM}_N \geqslant d_{N;1-\alpha}) = \alpha.$$

4.2 Limit results under alternatives

The limit behavior in probability of the test statistics (4.5) and (4.6) is given in the following result. It holds under the hypotheses as well as under alternatives.

Theorem 9. *It is*

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 : P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{nr}} \mathrm{KS}_N \geqslant \sup_{z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u} |T(F, G)(z) - Q(F, G)(z)| - \varepsilon + o_p(1) \right) \longrightarrow 1 \text{ as } \min N \to \infty,$$

and

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 : P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{nr}} \mathrm{CvM}_N \geqslant \int \left(T(F, G)(z) - Q(F, G)(z) \right)^2 T(J)(\mathrm{d}z) - \varepsilon + o_p(1) \right) \longrightarrow 1$$
$$\text{as } \min N \to \infty.$$

The following corollary is important for consistency considerations with respect to the test (4.7).

Corollary 12. *Suppose T and Q are uniformly Hadamard differentiable in J with Hadamard derivative $\mathrm{d}T(J)$ and $\mathrm{d}Q(J)$, respectively. Assume J is uniformly continuous and the distribution function of $\sup_{z\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^u}|U(z)|$ or $\int U^2(z)T(J)(\mathrm{d}z)$ is strictly increasing on the non-negative half-line. Moreover, assume $T(F,G)-Q(F,G)$ does not vanish everywhere or $T(J)$-almost everywhere. Then,*

$$\lim_{\min N\to\infty} P(\mathrm{KS}_N \geqslant c_{N;1-\alpha}) = 1 \text{ or } \lim_{\min N\to\infty} P(\mathrm{CvM}_N \geqslant d_{N;1-\alpha}) = 1.$$

4.3 Testing homogeneity

Consider the two sample case with equal dimensions $m = s = u$ and equal sample sizes $n = r$. Suppose $F_1,\dots,F_n$ and $G_1,\dots,G_n$ are unknown, $\alpha_{1,n},\dots,\alpha_{n,n}$ and $\beta_{1,n},\dots,\beta_{n,n}$ are known and that the user has to treat the hypothesis of homogeneity

$$\mathrm{H}_n : \mathbb{F}_n = \mathbb{G}_n \tag{4.8}$$

on the basis of the observations $X_1,\dots,X_n$ and $V_1,\dots,V_n$.

In this situation, the maps $T : \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)\times\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \to \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ and $Q : \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)\times\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \to \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ are given by the continuous maps

$$T(K_1,K_2) = K_1,\ Q(K_1,K_2) = K_2,\ K = (K_1,K_2) \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)\times\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m).$$

Let $K = (K_1,K_2)$ and $L = (L_1,L_2)$ be arbitrary objects from the definition of the uniformly Hadamard differentiability given above. Now, the maps T and Q are uniformly Hadamard differentiable in K with Hadamard derivative

$$\mathrm{d}T(K)(L) = L_1 \text{ and } \mathrm{d}Q(K)(L) = L_2,$$

respectively. Let $j : \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)\times\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \to \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)\times\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ be the continuous map

$$j(K) = \Big(\frac{1}{2}(K_1+K_2), \frac{1}{2}(K_1+K_2)\Big),\ K = (K_1,K_2) \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)\times\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m).$$

Obviously, it is $T\circ j = Q\circ j$ and $j(K) = (K)$ for all $K \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)\times\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ with $T(K) = Q(K)$. Thus,

$$\hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,m} = \hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,s} = \frac{1}{2}\big(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n + \hat{\mathbb{G}}_n\big),$$

the test statistics have the expressions

$$\mathrm{KS}_n = \sqrt{n}\sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m}|\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x) - \hat{\mathbb{G}}_n(x)| \tag{4.9}$$

as well as

$$\mathrm{CvM}_n = n\int \big(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x) - \hat{\mathbb{G}}_n(x)\big)^2 \frac{1}{2}\big(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n + \hat{\mathbb{G}}_n\big)(\mathrm{d}x) \tag{4.10}$$

and testing procedure

$$\text{“Reject } \mathrm{H}_n, \text{ iff } \mathrm{KS}_n \geqslant c_{n;1-\alpha}\text{” or testing procedure “Reject } \mathrm{H}_n, \text{ iff } \mathrm{CvM}_n \geqslant d_{n;1-\alpha}\text{”} \tag{4.11}$$

is suggested, where $c_{n;1-\alpha}$ and $d_{n;1-\alpha}$ are calculated under $(F_1,\dots,F_n) = (G_1,\dots,G_n) = (\hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,m},\dots,\hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,m})$. If $\alpha_{i,n} = \beta_{i,n}$, $i = 1,\dots,n$, testing procedure (4.11), in particular the statistic (4.9) or (4.10), is invariant under the transformation of the data

$$\big((x_1,\dots,x_n),(v_1,\dots,v_n)\big) \longmapsto \big((v_1,\dots,v_n),(x_1,\dots,x_n)\big),$$
$$\big((x_1,\dots,x_n),(v_1,\dots,v_n)\big) \in \times_{i=1}^n\mathbb{R}^m \times \times_{i=1}^n\mathbb{R}^m.$$

Moreover, $\mathbb{U}$ is a Gaussian process with expectation function identically equal to zero. Moreover,

$$\mathrm{Var}\big(U(x)\big) = \mathrm{Var}\big(M_m(x)\big) + \mathrm{Var}\big(M_s(x)\big) = (\kappa+\tau)\big(J_m(x) - J_m^2(x)\big),\ x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m.$$

Because F and G are uniformly continuous, J_m is uniformly continuous, too, and the map $x \mapsto \mathrm{Var}(U(x))$, $x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$, does not vanish everywhere or $T(J)$-almost everywhere. For that reason, the distribution function of $\sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |U(x)|$ or $\int U^2(x)T(J)(\mathrm{d}x)$ is strictly increasing on the non-negative half-line.

Remark 6. *a) Modify the model introduced in Section 1 in the following way. Add independent and identically distributed real valued random variables $U_1, U_2, \ldots$ with unknown underlying distribution and independent but not necessarily identically distributed real valued random variables $W_1, W_2, \ldots$ with distribution $\mathcal{L}(W_i) = \mathcal{L}(Z_i)$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, the distribution of the error variable $\mathcal{L}(Z_i)$ and the error function e_i are possibly unknown for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume the random variables $Y_1, Y_2, \ldots$, $Z_1, Z_2, \ldots$, $U_1, U_2, \ldots$ and $W_1, W_2, \ldots$ are independent. Suppose the user has to treat the testing problem of homogeneity*

$$\mathrm{H} : \mathcal{L}(Y_1) = \mathcal{L}(U_1),\ \mathrm{K} : \mathcal{L}(Y_1) \neq \mathcal{L}(U_1)$$

on the basis of the observations $e_1(Y_1, Z_1), \ldots, e_n(Y_n, Z_n)$ and $e_1(U_1, W_1), \ldots, e_n(U_n, W_n)$. Putting $\alpha_{i,n} = \beta_{i,n} = \frac{1}{n}$, $X_i = e_i(Y_i, Z_i)$ and $V_i = e_i(U_i, W_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, the test (4.11) is applicable to this testing problem. If the distribution function of $e(U_1, Z)$ is continuous, too, it follows from the results in this section that the test is of asymptotically exact size α and consistent.

b) The test (4.11) is applicable to the hypothesis

$$\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} : F_i = G_i.$$

Putting $\alpha_{i,n} = \beta_{i,n} = \frac{1}{n}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, the test (4.11) is also applicable to the hypothesis

$$\exists \pi_n : \{1, \ldots, n\} \to \{1, \ldots, n\} \text{ bijective } \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} : F_i = G_{\pi_n(i)}.$$

It follows from the results in this section that the test is of asymptotically exact size α and consistent with respect to suitable alternatives to this hypotheses.

c) Assume $F_i = F$ and $G_i = G$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Putting $\alpha_{i,n} = \beta_{i,n} = \frac{1}{n}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, the hypothesis (4.8) is a common hypothesis of homogeneity

$$\mathrm{H} : F = G,$$

the test statistic (4.9) or (4.10) is a common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises statistic for testing the hypothesis of homogeneity and the test (4.11) is a common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises test for testing the hypothesis of homogeneity in a multivariate setting. In this sense, a generalization of the identically distributed case is considered.

d) If $\alpha_{i,n} = \beta_{i,n} = \frac{1}{n}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, the test statistic (4.9) or (4.10) has the form of a common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises type statistic for testing the hypothesis of homogeneity and the test (4.11) hasthe form of a common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises type test for testing the hypothesis of homogeneity in the identically distributed case. I.e., the results in this section imply that the common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises type testing procedure for testing the hypothesis of homogeneity is applicable if the data come from different distributions and the mentioned conditions are fulfilled.

4.4 Testing central symmetry

In order to apply the general results above to the hypothesis of central symmetry, another sample is needed. Let $U_1, U_2, \ldots$ be a sequence of independent but not necessarily identically distributed random vectors with values in $\mathbb{R}^u$. For $i \in \mathbb{N}$, the random vector U_i has the distribution function C_i defined on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^u$. Assume the existence of an uniformly continuous distribution function C defined on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^u$ with

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} C_i = C \text{ uniformly on } \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u.$$

For a given distribution function K defined on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^u$ with related probability measure μ on $\overline{\mathfrak{B}}^u$, i.e., $K(z) = \mu([-\infty_u, z])$, $u \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u$, write $K^+ := K$ and $K^-(z) := \mu([-z, \infty_u])$, $z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u$. $\overline{\mathfrak{B}}^u$ denotes the Borel σ-field on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^u$ and $[z, w] := \times_{i=1}^u [z_i, w_i]$, $z, w \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u$, $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_u)'$, $w = (w_1, \ldots, w_u)'$, if $z_i \leqslant w_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, u$, and $[z, w] := \varnothing$ else. Moreover, $\infty_l := (\infty, \ldots, \infty)' \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^l$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Clearly, K^- is a distribution function. A distribution function K^+ or a probability measure μ is called centrally symmetric, iff $K^+ = K^-$ or $\mu([-\infty_u, z]) = \mu([-z, \infty_u])$ for all $z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u$. A random vector ξ with values in $\mathbb{R}^u$ has a centrally symmetric distribution function iff ξ and $-\xi$ have the same distribution. Concepts of symmetry in multivariate settings are presented by Serfling [29].

For $i \in \mathbb{N}$, denote by $C_i^+ = C_i$ and C_i^- the distribution functions of U_i and $-U_i$, respectively. Suppose $C_1, \ldots, C_n$ are unknown, $\alpha_{1,n}, \ldots, \alpha_{n,n}$ are known and that the user has to treat the hypothesis

$$\mathrm{H}_n : \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n} C_i^+ = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n} C_i^- \tag{4.12}$$

on the basis of the observations $U_1, \ldots, U_n$. Regarding

$$P(-U_i \leqslant z) = 1 - \sum_{k=1}^u (-1)^{k+1} \sum_{1 \leqslant j_1 < \cdots < j_k \leqslant u} P(U_{i,j_1} < -z_{j_1}, \ldots, U_{i,j_k} < -z_{j_k}),$$
$$z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u,\ i \in \mathbb{N},$$

it is obvious that the hypothesis (4.12) is equivalent to the hypothesis of central symmetry about the mixture distribution $\mathbb{C}_n(z) := \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n} C_i(z)$, $z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$,

$$\mathrm{H}_n : \mathbb{C}_n^+ = \mathbb{C}_n^-.$$

In order to apply the general results above, consider the random vectors

$$\begin{pmatrix} U_1 \\ -U_1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} U_2 \\ -U_2 \end{pmatrix}, \ldots \tag{4.13}$$

with values in $\mathbb{R}^{2u}$. Because

$$\begin{aligned} &P(U_i \leqslant z, -U_i \leqslant w) \\ =&P(U_i \leqslant z) - \sum_{k=1}^u (-1)^{k+1} \sum_{1 \leqslant j_1 < \cdots < j_k \leqslant u} P(U_{i,j_1} < -w_{j_1}, \ldots, U_{i,j_k} < -w_{j_k}, U_i \leqslant z), \\ &z, w \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u,\ i \in \mathbb{N}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

the uniformly convergence of the sequence of distribution functions $(C_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ to the uniformly continuous distribution function C implies that the sequence of distribution functions of the random vectors (4.13) has those limit properties, too. For that reason, the sequence of distribution functions of the random vectors (4.13) fulfills the model assumptions in the general model described above.

Well, consider the one sample case with dimension $m = 2u$ and the sequence of random vectors $X_1 = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} U_1 \\ -U_1 \end{smallmatrix}\right), X_2 = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} U_2 \\ -U_2 \end{smallmatrix}\right), \ldots$ with values in $\mathbb{R}^m$. Then, the hypothesis (4.12) is

equivalent to the hypothesis of homogeneity of the first u-dimensional marginal distribution and the last u-dimensional marginal distribution about the mixture distribution $\mathbb{F}_n$.

In this situation, the maps $T : \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \to \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^u)$ and $Q : \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \to \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^u)$ are given by the continuous maps

$$T(K)(z) = K\binom{z}{\infty_u},\ Q(K)(z) = K\binom{\infty_u}{z},\ z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u,\ K \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m).$$

Let K and L be arbitrary objects from the definition of the uniformly Hadamard differentiability given above. Now, the maps T and Q are uniformly Hadamard differentiable in K with Hadamard derivative

$$\mathrm{d}T(K)(L)(z) = L\binom{z}{\infty_u} \text{ and } \mathrm{d}Q(K)(L)(z) = L\binom{\infty_u}{z},\ z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u,$$

respectively. Let $j : \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \to \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ be the continuous map

$$j(K)\binom{z}{w} = \frac{1}{2}\Big(K\binom{z}{w} + K\binom{w}{z}\Big),\ z, w \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u,\ K \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m).$$

It is $T \circ j = Q \circ j$ and $j(K) = K$ for all $K \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ with $T(K) = Q(K)$. Thus,

$$\hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,m}\binom{z}{w} = \frac{1}{2}\Big(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n\binom{z}{w} + \hat{\mathbb{F}}_n\binom{w}{z}\Big),\ z, w \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u,$$

and

$$T\big(\hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,m}\big)(z) = \frac{1}{2}\big(\hat{\mathbb{C}}_n^+(z) + \hat{\mathbb{C}}_n^-(z)\big),\ z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u,$$

where

$$\hat{\mathbb{C}}_n^+(z) := \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\mathrm{I}(U_i \leqslant z),\ \hat{\mathbb{C}}_n^-(z) := \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\mathrm{I}(-U_i \leqslant z),\ z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u.$$

The test statistics have the expressions

$$\mathrm{KS}_n = \sqrt{n}\sup_{z\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^u} |\mathbb{C}_n^+(z) - \mathbb{C}_n^-(z)| \tag{4.15}$$

and

$$\mathrm{CvM}_n = n\int \big(\mathbb{C}_n^+(z) - \mathbb{C}_n^-(z)\big)^2 \frac{1}{2}\big(\hat{\mathbb{C}}_n^+ + \hat{\mathbb{C}}_n^-\big)(\mathrm{d}z). \tag{4.16}$$

In the special case of $m = 1$ and $\alpha_{i,n} = \frac{1}{n}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, the statistic (4.15) is considered in [7]. Now, testing procedure

$$\text{“Reject } \mathrm{H}_n, \text{ iff } \mathrm{KS}_n \geqslant c_{n;1-\alpha}\text{” or testing procedure “Reject } \mathrm{H}_n, \text{ iff } \mathrm{CvM}_n \geqslant d_{n;1-\alpha}\text{”} \tag{4.17}$$

is suggested, where $c_{n;1-\alpha}$ and $d_{n;1-\alpha}$ are calculated under $(F_1, \ldots, F_n) = (\hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,m}, \ldots, \hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,m})$. Testing procedure (4.17), in particular the statistic (4.15) or (4.16), is invariant under the transformation of the data

$$(z_1, \ldots, z_n) \longmapsto (-z_1, \ldots, -z_n),\ (z_1, \ldots, z_n) \in \times_{i=1}^n \mathbb{R}^u.$$

Moreover, $\mathbb{U}$ is a Gaussian process with expectation function identically equal to zero and

$$\mathrm{Var}\big(U(z)\big) = \mathrm{Var}\big(M_m\binom{z}{\infty_u}\big) + \mathrm{Var}\big(M_m\binom{\infty_u}{z}\big) - 2\mathrm{Cov}\big(M_m\binom{z}{\infty_u}, M_m\binom{\infty_u}{z}\big) = 2\kappa J\binom{z}{\infty_u},$$
$$z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u.$$

Because F is uniformly continuous, J is uniformly continuous, too, and the map $z \mapsto \mathrm{Var}(U(z))$, $z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^u$, does not vanish everywhere or $T(J)$-almost everywhere. For that reason, the distribution function of $\sup_{z\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^u} |U(z)|$ or $\int U^2(z)T(J)(\mathrm{d}z)$ is strictly increasing on the non-negative half-line.

Remark 7. *a) Modify the model introduced in Section 1 in the following way. Assume the error variable Z_i has a centrally symmetric distribution function for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, the distribution $\mathcal{L}(Z_i)$ is possibly unknown for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose the user has to treat the testing problem of central symmetry*

$$\mathrm{H} : \mathcal{L}(Y_1) = \mathcal{L}(-Y_1), \ \mathrm{K} : \mathcal{L}(Y_1) \neq \mathcal{L}(-Y_1)$$

on the basis of the observations $Y_1+Z_1, \ldots, Y_n+Z_n$. Putting $\alpha_{i,n} = \frac{1}{n}$ and $U_i = Y_i+Z_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, the test (4.17) is applicable to this testing problem. It follows from the results in this section that the test is of asymptotically exact size α and consistent.

b) The test (4.17) is applicable to the hypothesis

$$\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} : C_i^+ = C_i^-.$$

Putting $\alpha_{i,n} = \frac{1}{n}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, the test (4.17) is also applicable to the hypothesis

$$\exists \pi_n : \{1, \ldots, n\} \to \{1, \ldots, n\} \text{ bijective } \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} : C_i^+ = C_{\pi_n(i)}^-.$$

The test is of asymptotically exact size α and consistent with respect to suitable alternatives to this hypotheses. This follows from the results in this section.

c) Assume $C_i = C$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Putting $\alpha_{i,n} = \frac{1}{n}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, the hypothesis (4.12) is a common hypothesis of central symmetry

$$\mathrm{H} : C^+ = C^-,$$

the test statistic (4.15) or (4.16) is a common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises statistic for testing the hypothesis of central symmetry and the test (4.17) is a common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises test for testing the hypothesis of central symmetry in a multivariate setting. In this sense, a generalization of the identically distributed case is considered.

d) If $\alpha_{i,n} = \frac{1}{n}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, the test statistic (4.15) or (4.16) has the form of a common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises type statistic for testing the hypothesis of central symmetry and the test (4.17) has the form of a common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises type test for testing the hypothesis of central symmetry in the identically distributed case. I.e., the results in this section imply that the common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises type testing procedure for testing the hypothesis of central symmetry is applicable if the data come from different distributions and the mentioned conditions are fulfilled.

4.5 Testing independence

Consider the one sample case with dimension $m \geqslant 2$, $m = k + \ell$, $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$, and that the sequence of random vectors $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ is given by

$$X_1 = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 \\ B_1 \end{pmatrix}, X_2 = \begin{pmatrix} A_2 \\ B_2 \end{pmatrix}, \ldots,$$

with $\mathbb{R}^k$-valued random vectors $A_1, A_2, \ldots$ and $\mathbb{R}^\ell$-valued random vectors $B_1, B_2, \ldots$. For $i \in \mathbb{N}$, denote by F_i^A and F_i^B the distribution functions defined on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^k$ and $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^\ell$ of A_i and B_i, respectively. Suppose $F_1, \ldots, F_n$ are unknown, $\alpha_{1,n}, \ldots, \alpha_{n,n}$ are known and that the user has to verify the hypothesis of independence

$$\forall (a, b) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^k \times \overline{\mathbb{R}}^\ell : \mathbb{F}_n\left(\begin{smallmatrix} a \\ b \end{smallmatrix}\right) = \mathbb{F}_n\left(\begin{smallmatrix} a \\ \infty_\ell \end{smallmatrix}\right) \mathbb{F}_n\left(\begin{smallmatrix} \infty_k \\ b \end{smallmatrix}\right) \tag{4.18}$$

on the basis of the observations $X_1, \ldots, X_n$.

In this situation, the maps $T : \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \to \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ and $Q : \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \to \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ are given by the continuous maps

$$T(K)\binom{a}{b} = K\binom{a}{b},\ Q(K)\binom{a}{b} = K\binom{a}{\infty_\ell}K\binom{\infty_k}{b},\ (a,b) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^k \times \overline{\mathbb{R}}^\ell,\ K \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m).$$

Let K and L be arbitrary objects from the definition of the uniformly Hadamard differentiability given above. Now, the maps T and Q are uniformly Hadamard differentiable in K with Hadamard derivative

$$\mathrm{d}T(K)(L)\binom{a}{b} = L\binom{a}{b} \text{ and } \mathrm{d}Q(K)(L)\binom{a}{b} = K\binom{a}{\infty_\ell}L\binom{\infty_k}{b} + K\binom{\infty_k}{b}L\binom{a}{\infty_\ell},\ (a,b) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^k \times \overline{\mathbb{R}}^\ell,$$

respectively. Let $j : \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m) \to \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ be the continuous map

$$j(K)\binom{a}{b} = K\binom{a}{\infty_\ell}K\binom{\infty_k}{b},\ (a,b) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^k \times \overline{\mathbb{R}}^\ell,\ K \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m).$$

Obviously, $T \circ j = Q \circ j$ and $j(K) = K$ for all $K \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ with $T(K) = Q(K)$. Thus,

$$\hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,m}\binom{a}{b} = \hat{\mathbb{F}}_n\binom{a}{\infty_\ell}\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n\binom{\infty_k}{b} = \hat{\mathbb{F}}_n^A(a)\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n^B(b),\ (a,b) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^k \times \overline{\mathbb{R}}^\ell,$$

where

$$\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n^A(a) := \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\mathrm{I}(A_i \leqslant a),\ \hat{\mathbb{F}}_n^B(b) := \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\mathrm{I}(B_i \leqslant b),\ (a,b) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^k \times \overline{\mathbb{R}}^\ell.$$

Now, the test statistics have the expressions

$$\mathrm{KS}_n = \sqrt{n} \sup_{(a,b)\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^k\times\overline{\mathbb{R}}^\ell} |\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n\binom{a}{b} - \hat{\mathbb{F}}_n^A(a)\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n^B(b)| \tag{4.19}$$

and

$$\mathrm{CvM}_n = n \int\int \big(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n\binom{a}{b} - \hat{\mathbb{F}}_n^A(a)\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n^B(b)\big)^2 \hat{\mathbb{F}}_n^A(\mathrm{d}a)\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n^B(\mathrm{d}b). \tag{4.20}$$

In addition, testing procedure

$$\text{“Reject } \mathrm{H}_n, \text{ iff } \mathrm{KS}_n \geqslant c_{n;1-\alpha}\text{” or testing procedure “Reject } \mathrm{H}_n, \text{ iff } \mathrm{CvM}_n \geqslant d_{n;1-\alpha}\text{”} \tag{4.21}$$

is suggested, where $c_{n;1-\alpha}$ and $d_{n;1-\alpha}$ are calculated under $(F_1, \ldots, F_n) = (\hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,m}, \ldots, \hat{\mathbb{J}}_{N,m})$. If $k = \ell$, testing procedure (4.21), in particular the statistic (4.19) or (4.20), is invariant under the transformation of the data

$$\big((a_1,b_1),\ldots,(a_n,b_n)\big) \longmapsto \big((b_1,a_1),\ldots,(b_n,a_n)\big),\ \big((a_1,b_1),\ldots,(a_n,b_n)\big) \in \times_{i=1}^n(\mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^k).$$

Moreover, $\mathbb{U}$ is a Gaussian process with expectation function identically equal to zero. Moreover, a calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Var}\big(U\binom{a}{b}\big) =& \mathrm{Var}\big(M_m\binom{a}{b}\big) + J^2\binom{a}{\infty_\ell}\mathrm{Var}\big(M_m\binom{\infty_k}{b}\big) + J^2\binom{\infty_k}{b}\mathrm{Var}\big(M_m\binom{a}{\infty_\ell}\big) \\
&- 2J\binom{a}{\infty_\ell}\mathrm{Cov}\big(M_m\binom{a}{b}, M_m\binom{\infty_k}{b}\big) - 2J\binom{\infty_k}{b}\mathrm{Cov}\big(M_m\binom{a}{b}, M_m\binom{a}{\infty_\ell}\big) \\
&+ 2J\binom{a}{\infty_\ell}J\binom{\infty_k}{b}\mathrm{Cov}\big(M_m\binom{\infty_k}{b}, M_m\binom{a}{\infty_\ell}\big) \\
=& J\binom{a}{\infty_\ell}\big(1 - J\binom{a}{\infty_\ell}\big)J\binom{\infty_k}{b}\big(1 - J\binom{\infty_k}{b}\big),\ (a,b) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^k \times \overline{\mathbb{R}}^\ell.
\end{aligned}$$

Because F is uniformly continuous, J is uniformly continuous, too, and the map $\binom{a}{b} \mapsto \mathrm{Var}(U\binom{a}{b}),\ (a,b) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^k \times \overline{\mathbb{R}}^\ell$, does not vanish everywhere or $T(J)$-almost everywhere. For that reason, the distribution function of $\sup_{(a,b)\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^k\times\overline{\mathbb{R}}^l} |U\binom{a}{b}|$ or $\int U^2\binom{a}{b}T(J)(\mathrm{d}\binom{a}{b})$ is strictly increasing on the non-negative half-line.

Remark 8. *a) Modify the model introduced in Section 1 in the following way. Replace the sequence of random variables $Y_1, Y_2, \ldots$ with a sequence of independent and identically distributed $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$-valued random vectors $(Y_1, W_1), (Y_2, W_2)$ and assume this sequence is still independent of $Z_1, Z_2, \ldots$. Now, the distribution of the error variable $\mathcal{L}(Z_i)$*

and the error function e_i are possibly unknown for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose the user has to treat the testing problem of independence

$$\mathrm{H} : \mathcal{L}(Y_1, W_1) = \mathcal{L}(Y_1) \otimes \mathcal{L}(W_1), \ \mathrm{K} : \mathcal{L}(Y_1, W_1) \neq \mathcal{L}(Y_1) \otimes \mathcal{L}(W_1)$$

on the basis of the observations $(e_1(Y_1, Z_1), W_1), \ldots, (e_n(Y_n, Z_n), W_n)$. Putting $\alpha_{i,n} = \frac{1}{n}$ and $X_i = (e_i(Y_i, Z_i), W_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, the test (4.21) is applicable to this testing problem. If the distribution function of $(e_i(Y_i, Z_i), W_i)$ converges uniformly on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ to the distribution function of $(e(Y_1, Z), W_1)$ and the distribution function of $(e(Y_1, Z), W_1)$ is uniformly continuous, it follows from the results in this section that the test is of asymptotically exact size α and consistent.

b) *Assume $F_1^B = \cdots = F_n^B$. Then, the test (4.21) is applicable to the hypothesis*

$$\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \ \forall (a, b) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^k \times \overline{\mathbb{R}}^\ell : F_i(\tbinom{a}{b}) = F_i^A(a) F_i^B(b).$$

The test is of asymptotically exact size α and consistent with respect to suitable alternatives to this hypothesis. This follows from the results in this section.

c) *Assume $F_i = F$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Putting $\alpha_{i,n} = \frac{1}{n}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, the hypothesis (4.18) is a common hypothesis of independence*

$$\mathrm{H} : \forall (a, b) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^k \times \overline{\mathbb{R}}^\ell : F(\tbinom{a}{b}) = F^A(a) F^B(b),$$

the test statistic (4.19) or (4.20) is a common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises statistic for testing the hypothesis of independence and the test (4.21) is a common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises test for testing the hypothesis of independence in a multivariate setting. In this sense, a generalization of the identically distributed case is considered.

d) *If $\alpha_{i,n} = \frac{1}{n}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, the test statistic (4.19) or (4.20) has the form of a common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises type statistic for testing the hypothesis of independence and the test (4.21) has the form of a common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises type test for testing the hypothesis of independence in the identically distributed case. I.e., the results in this section imply that the common Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von-Mises type testing procedure for testing the hypothesis of independence is applicable if $A_1, A_2, \ldots$ come from different distributions, $B_1, B_2, \ldots$ are identically distributed and the mentioned conditions are fulfilled.*

5 Simulations

Empirical results for the probabilities of the error of the first kind and the power values of the mentioned tests for finite sample sizes are presented. The simulation based on 1000 replications and the Monte-Carlo procedures based on 500 replications.

5.1 Goodness-of-fit with hypotheses given by a specific distribution

Assume $m = 1$, $\alpha_{i,n} = \frac{1}{n}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, and consider the distribution function $\ell(\mu_i, 1)$ of the logistic distribution with parameters $\mu_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and 1, $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $(\mu_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is known and there exists a $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\lim_{i \to \infty} \mu_i = \mu$. The upper part of Table 1 shows the empirical error probabilities of the first kind in the case of $F_i = \ell(\frac{1}{\log(i+1)}, 1)$ and $G_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\frac{1}{\log(i+1)}, 1)$, $F_i = \ell(\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}}, 1)$ and $G_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}}, 1)$ or $F_i = \ell(\frac{1}{i}, 1)$ and $G_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\frac{1}{i}, 1)$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$. The lower part of Table 1 shows the empirical power values in the case of $F_i = \mathrm{L}(-\frac{1}{i}, \frac{1}{2})$ (Laplace distribution) and $G_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\frac{1}{\log(i+1)}, 1)$, $F_i = \mathrm{C}(-\frac{1}{\log(i+1)}, \frac{1}{2})$ (Cauchy distribution) and $G_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}}, 1)$, or $F_i = \mathrm{N}(-\frac{1}{\log(i+1)}, \frac{1}{2})$ (normal distribution) and $G_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\frac{1}{i}, 1)$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

F_i	G_n		$\alpha=0.025$ KS	$\alpha=0.025$ CvM	$\alpha=0.05$ KS	$\alpha=0.05$ CvM	$\alpha=0.1$ KS	$\alpha=0.1$ CvM
$\ell(\frac{1}{\log(i+1)},1)$	$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\frac{1}{\log(i+1)},1)$	$n=25$	0.033	0.033	0.049	0.049	0.097	0.097
		$n=50$	0.026	0.026	0.044	0.044	0.096	0.096
$\ell(\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}},1)$	$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}},1)$	$n=25$	0.032	0.032	0.051	0.051	0.105	0.105
		$n=50$	0.026	0.026	0.066	0.066	0.106	0.106
$\ell(\frac{1}{i},1)$	$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\frac{1}{i},1)$	$n=25$	0.030	0.030	0.049	0.049	0.102	0.102
		$n=50$	0.023	0.023	0.051	0.051	0.109	0.109
$\mathrm{L}(-\frac{1}{i},\frac{1}{2})$	$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\frac{1}{\log(i+1)},1)$	$n=25$	0.510	0.510	0.715	0.715	0.879	0.879
		$n=50$	0.640	0.640	0.804	0.804	0.928	0.928
$\mathrm{C}(-\frac{1}{\log(i+1)},\frac{1}{2})$	$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}},1)$	$n=25$	0.780	0.780	0.862	0.862	0.931	0.931
		$n=50$	0.732	0.732	0.837	0.837	0.913	0.913
$\mathrm{N}(-\frac{1}{\log(i+1)},\frac{1}{2})$	$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\frac{1}{i},1)$	$n=25$	0.805	0.805	0.954	0.954	0.991	0.991
		$n=50$	0.750	0.750	0.909	0.909	0.991	0.991

Table 1: Simulation results for goodness-of-fit with hypotheses given by a specific distribution.

F_i	$G_n(\cdot,\vartheta)$		$\alpha=0.025$ KS	$\alpha=0.025$ CvM	$\alpha=0.05$ KS	$\alpha=0.05$ CvM	$\alpha=0.1$ KS	$\alpha=0.1$ CvM
$\mathrm{Exp}(1+\frac{1}{\log(i+1)})$	$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{Exp}(\vartheta+\frac{1}{\log(i+1)})$	$n=25$	0.035	0.035	0.066	0.066	0.102	0.102
		$n=50$	0.024	0.024	0.039	0.039	0.083	0.083
$\mathrm{Exp}(2+\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}})$	$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{Exp}(\vartheta+\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}})$	$n=25$	0.025	0.025	0.048	0.048	0.088	0.088
		$n=50$	0.025	0.025	0.049	0.049	0.096	0.096
$\mathrm{Exp}(3+\frac{1}{i})$	$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{Exp}(\vartheta+\frac{1}{i})$	$n=25$	0.029	0.029	0.055	0.055	0.101	0.101
		$n=50$	0.018	0.018	0.045	0.045	0.087	0.087
$\mathrm{W}(1+\frac{1}{\log(1+i)},1)$	$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{Exp}(\vartheta+\frac{1}{\log(i+1)})$	$n=25$	0.241	0.241	0.386	0.386	0.584	0.584
		$n=50$	0.257	0.257	0.421	0.421	0.622	0.622
$\mathrm{IG}(\frac{2}{3},1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}})$	$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{Exp}(\vartheta+\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}})$	$n=25$	0.546	0.546	0.722	0.722	0.833	0.833
		$n=50$	0.796	0.796	0.902	0.902	0.955	0.955
$\mathrm{G}(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{1+\frac{1}{i}})$	$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{Exp}(\vartheta+\frac{1}{i})$	$n=25$	0.628	0.628	0.731	0.731	0.803	0.803
		$n=50$	0.870	0.870	0.910	0.910	0.939	0.939

Table 2: Simulation results for goodness-of-fit with hypotheses given by a family of distributions.

5.2 Goodness-of-fit with hypotheses given by a family of distributions

Let $m=d=1$, $\Theta=(0,\infty)$, $\alpha_{i,n}=\frac{1}{n}$, $i=1,\dots,n$, and consider the distribution function $\mathrm{Exp}(\vartheta+\mu_i)$ of the exponential distribution with rate $(\vartheta+\mu_i)\in(0,\infty)$, $i\in\mathbb{N}$. Suppose $(\mu_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is known and there exists a $\mu\in\mathbb{R}$ with $\lim_{i\to\infty}\mu_i=\mu$ and $\vartheta+\mu>0$. An estimator introduced in Remark 5 is used. The upper part of Table 2 shows the empirical error probabilities of the first kind in the case of $F_i=\mathrm{Exp}(1+\frac{1}{\log(i+1)})$ and $G_n(\cdot,\vartheta)=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\mathrm{Exp}(\vartheta+\frac{1}{\log(i+1)})$, $F_i=\mathrm{Exp}(2+\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}})$ and $G_n(\cdot,\vartheta)=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\mathrm{Exp}(\vartheta+\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}})$ or $F_i=\mathrm{Exp}(3+\frac{1}{i})$ and $G_n(\cdot,\vartheta)=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\mathrm{Exp}(\vartheta+\frac{1}{i})$, $i\in\mathbb{N}$. The lower part of Table 2 shows the empirical power values in the case of $F_i=\mathrm{W}(1+\frac{1}{\log(1+i)},1)$ (Weibull distribution) and $G_n(\cdot,\vartheta)=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\mathrm{Exp}(\vartheta+\frac{1}{\log(i+1)})$, $F_i=\mathrm{IG}(\frac{2}{3},1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}})$ (inverse Gaussian distribution) and $G_n(\cdot,\vartheta)=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\mathrm{Exp}(\vartheta+\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}})$, or $F_i=\mathrm{G}(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{1+\frac{1}{i}})$ (gamma distribution) and $G_n(\cdot,\vartheta)=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\mathrm{Exp}(\vartheta+\frac{1}{i})$, $i\in\mathbb{N}$.

F_i	G_i		$\alpha=0.025$ KS	$\alpha=0.025$ CvM	$\alpha=0.05$ KS	$\alpha=0.05$ CvM	$\alpha=0.1$ KS	$\alpha=0.1$ CvM
$\mathrm{W}(1+\frac{1}{\log(1+i)},1)$	$\mathrm{W}(1+\frac{1}{\log(1+i)},1)$	$n=25$	0.026	0.026	0.056	0.052	0.110	0.102
		$n=50$	0.026	0.030	0.047	0.050	0.093	0.098
$\mathrm{IG}(\frac{2}{3},1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}})$	$\mathrm{IG}(\frac{2}{3},1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}})$	$n=25$	0.031	0.027	0.053	0.055	0.101	0.106
		$n=50$	0.026	0.024	0.045	0.051	0.097	0.109
$\mathrm{Exp}(1+\frac{1}{i})$	$\mathrm{Exp}(1+\frac{1}{i})$	$n=25$	0.022	0.021	0.048	0.040	0.104	0.088
		$n=50$	0.028	0.023	0.053	0.059	0.106	0.105
$\mathrm{Exp}(1+\frac{1}{i})$	$\mathrm{W}(1+\frac{1}{i},1/3)$	$n=25$	0.266	0.242	0.363	0.365	0.566	0.555
		$n=50$	0.622	0.571	0.762	0.759	0.876	0.891
$\mathrm{IG}(2,1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}})$	$\mathrm{G}(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}}})$	$n=25$	0.555	0.504	0.686	0.659	0.787	0.799
		$n=50$	0.899	0.932	0.964	0.979	0.990	0.997
$\mathrm{IG}(\frac{1}{2},1+\frac{1}{\log(i+1)})$	$\mathrm{W}(1+\frac{1}{\log(i+1)},\frac{1}{2})$	$n=25$	0.075	0.075	0.119	0.131	0.224	0.218
		$n=50$	0.281	0.235	0.389	0.361	0.569	0.556

Table 3: Simulation results for homogeneity.

C_i		$\alpha=0.025$ KS	$\alpha=0.025$ CvM	$\alpha=0.05$ KS	$\alpha=0.05$ CvM	$\alpha=0.1$ KS	$\alpha=0.1$ CvM
$\mathrm{N}(0,1+\frac{1}{\log(i+1)})$	$n=25$	0.020	0.025	0.038	0.045	0.083	0.087
	$n=50$	0.027	0.028	0.054	0.053	0.095	0.098
$\ell(0,\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}})$	$n=25$	0.033	0.037	0.055	0.063	0.088	0.105
	$n=50$	0.024	0.016	0.045	0.044	0.102	0.101
$\mathrm{C}(0,2+\frac{1}{i})$	$n=25$	0.016	0.023	0.035	0.046	0.071	0.089
	$n=50$	0.036	0.035	0.059	0.059	0.104	0.111
$\mathrm{N}(\frac{1}{2},1+\frac{1}{\log(i+1)})$	$n=25$	0.210	0.248	0.320	0.374	0.422	0.472
	$n=50$	0.491	0.581	0.620	0.699	0.729	0.787
$\ell(\frac{1}{3},\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}})$	$n=25$	0.135	0.154	0.201	0.230	0.284	0.324
	$n=50$	0.308	0.364	0.421	0.468	0.530	0.593
$\mathrm{C}(\frac{3}{2},2+\frac{1}{i})$	$n=25$	0.379	0.346	0.493	0.443	0.604	0.583
	$n=50$	0.758	0.705	0.848	0.800	0.904	0.873

Table 4: Simulation results for central symmetry.

5.3 Homogeneity

Let $m=1$ and $\alpha_{i,n}=\beta_{i,n}=\frac{1}{n}$, $i=1,\dots,n$. The upper part of Table 3 shows the empirical error probabilities of the first kind in the case of $F_i=G_i=\mathrm{W}(1+\frac{1}{\log(1+i)},1)$ (Weibull distribution), $F_i=G_i=\mathrm{IG}(\frac{2}{3},1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}})$ (inverse Gaussian distribution), or $F_i=G_i=\mathrm{Exp}(1+\frac{1}{i})$ (exponential distribution), $i\in\mathbb{N}$. The lower part of Table 3 shows the empirical power values in the case of $F_i=\mathrm{Exp}(1+\frac{1}{i})$ and $G_i=\mathrm{W}(1+\frac{1}{i},1/3)$, $F_i=\mathrm{IG}(2,1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}})$ and $G_i=\mathrm{G}(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}}})$ (gamma distribution), or $F_i=\mathrm{IG}(\frac{1}{2},1+\frac{1}{\log(i+1)})$ and $G_i=\mathrm{W}(1+\frac{1}{\log(i+1)},\frac{1}{2})$, $i\in\mathbb{N}$.

5.4 Central symmetry

Assume $m=1$ and $\alpha_{i,n}=\frac{1}{n}$, $i=1,\dots,n$. The upper part of Table 4 shows the empirical error probabilities of the first kind in the case of $C_i=\mathrm{N}(0,1+\frac{1}{\log(i+1)})$ (normal distribution), $C_i=\ell(0,\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}})$ (logistic distribution), or $C_i=\mathrm{C}(0,2+\frac{1}{i})$ (Cauchy distribution), $i\in\mathbb{N}$. The lower part of Table 4 shows the empirical power values in the case of $C_i=\mathrm{N}(\frac{1}{2},1+\frac{1}{\log(i+1)})$, $C_i=\ell(\frac{1}{3},\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}})$, or $C_i=\mathrm{C}(\frac{3}{2},2+\frac{1}{i})$, $i\in\mathbb{N}$.

F_i		$\alpha=0.025$ KS	$\alpha=0.025$ CvM	$\alpha=0.05$ KS	$\alpha=0.05$ CvM	$\alpha=0.1$ KS	$\alpha=0.1$ CvM
$\mathrm{N}(\frac{1}{i},1)\otimes\mathrm{N}(0,1)$	$n=25$	0.047	0.027	0.088	0.056	0.170	0.115
	$n=50$	0.035	0.024	0.070	0.052	0.137	0.105
$\ell(\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}},1)\otimes\ell(0,1)$	$n=25$	0.040	0.023	0.068	0.046	0.134	0.083
	$n=50$	0.034	0.018	0.066	0.045	0.119	0.104
$\mathrm{C}(\frac{1}{\log(1+i)},1)\otimes\mathrm{C}(0,1)$	$n=25$	0.052	0.028	0.095	0.057	0.160	0.110
	$n=50$	0.034	0.016	0.071	0.053	0.130	0.100
$\mathrm{N}_2(\frac{1}{i}\binom{1}{1},\binom{2\ 1}{1\ 2})$	$n=25$	0.487	0.548	0.600	0.642	0.720	0.730
	$n=50$	0.725	0.851	0.816	0.908	0.895	0.945
$t_1(\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}}\binom{1}{1},\binom{2\ 1}{1\ 2})$	$n=25$	0.664	0.678	0.786	0.787	0.871	0.870
	$n=50$	0.985	0.987	0.992	0.993	0.998	0.997
$\ell_2(\frac{1}{\log(i+1)},1,\frac{1}{\log(i+1)},1)$	$n=25$	0.965	0.990	0.986	0.997	0.997	0.999
	$n=50$	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000

Table 5: Simulation results for independence.

5.5 Independence

Assume $m=2$, $k=\ell=1$ and $\alpha_{i,n}=\frac{1}{n}$, $i=1,\dots,n$. The upper part of Table 5 shows the empirical error probabilities of the first kind in the case of $F_i=\mathrm{N}(\frac{1}{i},1)\otimes\mathrm{N}(0,1)$ (product of normal distributions), $F_i=\ell(\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}},1)\otimes\ell(0,1)$ (product of logistic distributions), or $F_i=\mathrm{C}(\frac{1}{\log(1+i)},1)\otimes\mathrm{C}(0,1)$ (product of Cauchy distributions), $i\in\mathbb{N}$. The lower part of Table 5 shows the empirical power values in the case of $F_i=\mathrm{N}_2(\frac{1}{i}\binom{1}{1},\binom{2\ 1}{1\ 2})$ (bivariate normal distribution), $F_i=t_1(\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}}\binom{1}{1},\binom{2\ 1}{1\ 2})$ (bivariate t-distribution), or $F_i=\ell_2(\frac{1}{\log(i+1)},1,\frac{1}{\log(i+1)},1)$ (bivariate logistic distribution), $i\in\mathbb{N}$.

6 Poofs

Remark 9. *Let $\gamma_{1,n},\dots,\gamma_{n,n}$ be a real numbers with*

$$\gamma_{i,n}\geqslant 0,\ i=1,\dots,n,\ \lim_{n\to\infty}\max_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n}\gamma_{i,n}=0,\ \lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\gamma_{i,n}=\gamma\in[1,\infty),$$

and let $r_{1,n},\dots,r_{n,n}$ be other real numbers such that for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$ $|r_{i,n}|<c\in(0,\infty)$, $i=1,\dots,n$, and

$$\forall\varepsilon>0\ \exists i_\varepsilon\in\mathbb{N}\ \exists n_\varepsilon\in\mathbb{N},\ i_\varepsilon\leqslant n_\varepsilon,\ \forall i>i_\varepsilon\ \forall n>n_\varepsilon,\ i\leqslant n:|r_{i,n}|\leqslant\varepsilon.$$

Then,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\gamma_{i,n}r_{i,n}=0.$$

Proof of Lemma 1. Define another triangular array $\eta_{1,n},\dots,\eta_{n,n}$ of row-wise independent random vectors with values in $\mathcal{X}:=\mathbb{R}^m\times[0,\infty)$ by $\eta_{1,n}:=(\xi_{1,n},n\alpha_{1,n}),\dots,\eta_{n,n}:=(\xi_{n,n},n\alpha_{n,n})$. Regard the process $\mathbb{W}_n:=(W_n(x);x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ as a process $\widetilde{\mathbb{W}}_n:=(\widetilde{W}_n(f);f\in\mathcal{V})$, where

$$\mathcal{V}:=\{f;f:\mathcal{X}\to\mathbb{R},f(w,u)=u\mathrm{I}(w\leqslant x),(w,u)\in\mathcal{X},x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m\}$$

and

$$\widetilde{W}_n(f):=\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\Bigg(\sum_{i=1}^{n}f(\eta_{i,n})-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathrm{E}\big(f(\eta_{i,n})\big)\Bigg),\ f\in\mathcal{V}.$$

It is possible to follow the argumentation in 4.2 in [40] and to check the conditions mentioned there in order to show that the process $\widetilde{\mathbb{W}}_n$ is asymptotically equicontinuous. By Dudley [12], $\{\{(w,u)\in\mathcal{X}; w_j - x > 0\}; x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}\}$ is a Vapnik-Červonenkis class, $j=1,\ldots,m$. For definition and details of Vapnik-Červonenkis classes, see [35]. Using Lemma 2.6.17 (i) and (ii) in [35], it follows that $\mathcal{C} := \{\{(w,u)\in\mathcal{X}; w\leqslant x\}; x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m\}$ is a Vapnik-Červonenkis class, too. Consequently, $\mathcal{H} := \{h; h:\mathcal{X}\to\mathbb{R}, h(w,u) = \mathrm{I}((w,u)\in C), (w,u)\in\mathcal{X}, C\in\mathcal{C}\} = \{h; h:\mathcal{X}\to\mathbb{R}, h(w,u) = \mathrm{I}(w\leqslant x), (w,u)\in\mathcal{X}, x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m\}$ is a Vapnik-Červonenkis graph class. Putting $g:\mathcal{X}\to\mathbb{R}$, $g(w,u) := u$, $(w,u)\in\mathcal{X}$, Lemma 2.16.18 (vi) in [35] implies that $g\cdot\mathcal{H} := \{gh; h\in\mathcal{H}\}$ is a Vapnik-Červonenkis graph class, too. Finally, $\mathcal{V} = g\cdot\mathcal{H}$ is a Vapnik-Červonenkis graph class.

Let E be the distribution function of the exponential distribution with rate parameter one. The map

$$d(f_1,f_2) := \int |f_1(z) - f_2(z)|(\Phi\otimes E)(\mathrm{d}z),\ \ f_1,f_2\in\mathcal{V},$$

defines a metric on $\mathcal{V}$ and $(\mathcal{V},d)$ is totally bounded. In fact,

$$\rho(x,y) = \int |f_1(z) - f_2(z)|(\Phi\otimes E)(\mathrm{d}z) = d(f_1,f_2),$$
$$f_1(w,u) := u\mathrm{I}(w\leqslant x),\ \ f_2(w,u) := u\mathrm{I}(w\leqslant y),\ \ (w,u)\in\mathcal{X},\ \ x,y\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m.$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{V}$ is a class of functions with envelope g given above. Moreover, from Lemma 2.4 in [40], $\mathcal{V}$ has uniformly integrable entropy. (2.1) yields

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{E}\big(g^2(\xi_{i,n}, n\alpha_{i,n})\big) = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\sum_{i=1}^n n\alpha_{i,n}^2 < \infty.$$

Remark 9 and (2.1) imply

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\sup_{f_1,f_2\in\mathcal{V},d(f_1,f_2)\leqslant\delta}\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{E}\Big(\big(f_1(\xi_{i,n},n\alpha_{i,n}) - f_2(\xi_{i,n},n\alpha_{i,n})\big)^2\Big)}$$
$$\leqslant\sqrt{\sup_{x,y\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m,\rho(x,y)\leqslant\delta}\kappa\Big(K(x) - 2K\big(\min(x,y)\big) + K(y)\Big)} \longrightarrow 0 \text{ as } \delta\downarrow 0.$$

Moreover,

$$\forall t>0: \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{E}\Big(g^2(\xi_{i,n},n\alpha_{i,n})\mathrm{I}\big(g(\xi_{i,n},n\alpha_{i,n}) > \sqrt{n}t\big)\Big)$$
$$\leqslant n\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}^2\mathrm{I}(\sqrt{n}\max_{1\leqslant j\leqslant n}\alpha_{j,n} > t) \longrightarrow 0 \text{ as } n\to\infty.$$

In all, it results from 4.2 in [40] that the process $\widetilde{\mathbb{W}}_n$ is asymptotically equicontinuous with respect to the metric space $(\mathcal{V},d)$, i.e.,

$$\forall\varepsilon>0: \limsup_{n\to\infty} P^*\Big(\sup_{f_1,f_2\in\mathcal{V},d(f_1,f_2)\leqslant\delta}|\widetilde{W}_n(f_1) - \widetilde{W}_n(f_2)| > \varepsilon\Big) \longrightarrow 0 \text{ as } \delta\downarrow 0.$$

It follows that

$$\forall\varepsilon>0: \limsup_{n\to\infty} P^*\Big(\sup_{x,y\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m,\rho(x,y)\leqslant\delta}|W_n(x) - W_n(y)| > \varepsilon\Big)$$
$$= \limsup_{n\to\infty} P^*\Big(\sup_{f_1,f_2\in\mathcal{V},d(f_1,f_2)\leqslant\delta}|\widetilde{W}_n(f_1) - \widetilde{W}_n(f_2)| > \varepsilon\Big) \longrightarrow 0 \text{ as } \delta\downarrow 0,$$

i.e., the statement. □

Remark 10. *Assume a sequence of distribution functions $K_1, K_2, \dots$ defined on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$ and a uniformly continuous distribution function K defined on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$ is given such that*

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} K_i = K \text{ uniformly on } \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m.$$

Then, Remark 9 and (2.1) imply

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n} K_i = K \text{ uniformly on } \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} n \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}^2 K_i = \kappa K \text{ uniformly on } \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m,$$

as well as

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{x,y\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} \left| n \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}^2 K_i(x) K_i(y) - \kappa K(x) K(y) \right| = 0.$$

Proof of Theorem 1. Consider n sufficiently large. Because $\mathbb{F}_n = G_n$,

$$U_n(x) = \sqrt{n}\big(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x) - \mathbb{F}_n(x)\big), \ x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m.$$

For that reason, the process $\mathbb{U}_n$ is asymptotically equicontinuous with respect to the metric space $(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m, \rho)$, see Lemma 1. For arbitrary $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \in \times_{i=1}^p \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$, $x = (x_1, \dots, x_p)$, and arbitrary $a \in \mathbb{R}^p \backslash \{0\}$, put

$$s_n^2 := n \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}^2 \operatorname{Var} \left(a' \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{I}(X_i \leqslant x_1) - F_i(x_1) \\ \vdots \\ \mathrm{I}(X_i \leqslant x_p) - F_i(x_p) \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

Remark 10 and $\mathbb{F}_n = G_n$ imply $\lim_{i\to\infty} F_i = G$ uniformly on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$. Regarding Remark 10 again,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} s_n^2 = \sum_{1\leqslant j,k\leqslant p} a_j a_k \kappa \Big(G\big(\min(x_j, x_k)\big) - G(x_j) G(x_k) \Big).$$

Assume without loss of generality $\lim_{n\to\infty} s_n^2 > 0$. With $|a|_1 := |a_1| + \dots + |a_p|$, it is

$$\begin{aligned} \forall t > 0 : \frac{1}{s_n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{E} \Bigg(& \left| a' \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{n}\alpha_{i,n}\big(\mathrm{I}(X_i \leqslant x_1) - F_i(x_1)\big) \\ \vdots \\ \sqrt{n}\alpha_{i,n}\big(\mathrm{I}(X_i \leqslant x_p) - F_i(x_p)\big) \end{pmatrix} \right|^2 \\ & \mathrm{I} \left(\left| a' \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{n}\alpha_{i,n}\big(\mathrm{I}(X_i \leqslant x_1) - F_i(x_1)\big) \\ \vdots \\ \sqrt{n}\alpha_{i,n}\big(\mathrm{I}(X_i \leqslant x_p) - F_i(x_p)\big) \end{pmatrix} \right| > \sqrt{s_n^2 t} \right) \Bigg) \\ & \leqslant \frac{|a|_1^2}{s_n^2} n \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}^2 \mathrm{I}\Big(|a|_1 \sqrt{n} \max_{1\leqslant j\leqslant n} \alpha_{j,n} > \sqrt{s_n^2 t} \Big) \longrightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty. \end{aligned}$$

For that reason, Lindeberg's condition is fulfilled and from Cramér-Wold device, the convergence of the finite dimensional marginal distributions of the process $\mathbb{U}_n$ to centered multivariate normal distributions follows. Finally,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \operatorname{Cov}\big(U_n(x), U_n(y)\big) = c(x, y), \ x, y \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m.$$

The statement follows from Theorem 1.5.4 in [35]. □

Proof of Corollary 1. With Theorem 1 and the Continuous Mapping Theorem, Theorem 1.3.6 in [35]. Details are given by Baringhaus and Gaigall in the proof of Theorem 3 in [4]. □

Proof of Theorem 2. The process $\mathbb{U}_n^{(n)}$ is a process based on the triangular array $X_1^{(n)}, \dots, X_n^{(n)}$ of row-wise independent and identically distributed random vectors with values in $\mathbb{R}^m$. The asymptotic of this process can be treated similar to the approach related to Theorem 1 without any additional conditions by using $\lim_{n\to\infty} G_n = G$ uniformly on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$. It follows the convergence of $\mathbb{U}_n^{(n)}$ to a Gaussian process with a.s. uniformly ρ-continuous sample paths and expectation function identically equal to zero. Finally, $\lim_{n\to\infty} G_n = G$ uniformly on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$ yields

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \operatorname{Cov}\big(U_n^{(n)}(x), U_n^{(n)}(y)\big) = c(x,y), \;\; x, y \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m. \qquad \square$$

Proof of Corollary 2. With Theorem 2 analogous to the Proof of Corollary 1. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 3. Because G is uniformly continuous, the restriction of the covariance function (2.10) to the diagonal of $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m \times \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$ does not vanish everywhere or G-almost everywhere. For that reason, the distribution function of $\sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |U(x)|$ or $\int U^2(x)G(\mathrm{d}x)$ is strictly increasing on the non-negative half-line. For details, consider the arguments in Remark 1 and in the Proof of Corollary 1 in [4]. Consequently, $\lim_{n\to\infty} c_{n;1-\alpha} = c_{1-\alpha}$, where $c_{1-\alpha}$ is the $(1-\alpha)$-Quantile of $\sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |U(x)|$, or $\lim_{n\to\infty} d_{n;1-\alpha} = d_{1-\alpha}$, where $d_{1-\alpha}$ is the $(1-\alpha)$-Quantile of $\int U^2(x)G(\mathrm{d}x)$, see Corollary 2. Finally, the statement follows from Corollary 1. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3. Using triangle inequality,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\mathrm{KS}_n \geqslant \sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |F(x) - G(x)| - \sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |-\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x) + G_n(x) + F(x) - G(x)|.$$

From Corollary 1 and Slutsky's Theorem,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x) - \mathbb{F}_n(x)| = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sqrt{n} \sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x) - \mathbb{F}_n(x)| = 0 \text{ in probability.}$$

For that reason,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |-\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x) + G_n(x) + F(x) - G(x)| \\
&\leqslant \sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x) - \mathbb{F}_n(x)| + \sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |\mathbb{F}_n(x) - F(x)| + \sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |G_n(x) - G(x)| \xrightarrow{P} 0 \text{ as } n\to\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

For arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$, Slutsky's Theorem implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\mathrm{KS}_n \geqslant \sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |F(x) - G(x)| - \varepsilon + o_p(1)\right) \\
\geqslant &P\left(\sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} |-\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x) + G_n(x) + F(x) - G(x)| + o_p(1) \leqslant \varepsilon\right) \longrightarrow 1 \text{ as } n\to\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

This yields the first statement. To show the second statement, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{n}\mathrm{CvM}_n \\
&= \int \big(F(x) - G(x)\big)^2 G(\mathrm{d}x) + \int \big(F(x) - G(x)\big)^2 G_n(\mathrm{d}x) - \int \big(F(x) - G(x)\big)^2 G(\mathrm{d}x) \\
&\quad + \int \Big(\big(\mathbb{F}_n(x) - G_n(x)\big)^2 - \big(F(x) - G(x)\big)^2\Big) G_n(\mathrm{d}x) \\
&\quad - \int \Big(\big(\mathbb{F}_n(x) - G_n(x)\big)^2 - \big(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x) - G_n(x)\big)^2\Big) G_n(\mathrm{d}x).
\end{aligned}$$

It is

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left| \int \big(F(x) - G(x)\big)^2 G_n(\mathrm{d}x) - \int \big(F(x) - G(x)\big)^2 G(\mathrm{d}x) \right| = 0.$$

Moreover, with Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\int\Big(\big(\mathbb{F}_n(x)-G_n(x)\big)^2-\big(F(x)-G(x)\big)^2\Big)G_n(\mathrm{d}x)\right|\\ \leqslant&2\sqrt{\int\Big(\big(\mathbb{F}_n(x)-F(x)\big)-\big(G_n(x)-G(x)\big)\Big)^2G_n(\mathrm{d}x)}\longrightarrow 0 \text{ as } n\to\infty.\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1 implies the convergence in distribution of the process defined by $\sqrt{n}(\mathbb{F}_n(x)-\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x))$, $x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$. G_n converges uniformly on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$ to G. Argumentation analogous to the Proof of Corollary 1 yields the convergence in distribution of $n\int(\mathbb{F}_n(x)-\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x))^2G_n(\mathrm{d}x)$. From Slutsky's Theorem,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int\Big(\mathbb{F}_n(x)-\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x)\Big)^2G_n(\mathrm{d}x)=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}n\int\Big(\mathbb{F}_n(x)-\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x)\Big)^2G_n(\mathrm{d}x)=0 \text{ in probability.}$$

Therefore, with Cauchy-Schwarz inequality again,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\int\Big(\big(\mathbb{F}_n(x)-G_n(x)\big)^2-\big(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x)-G_n(x)\big)^2\Big)G_n(\mathrm{d}x)\right|\\ \leqslant&2\sqrt{\int\Big(\mathbb{F}_n(x)-\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x)\Big)^2G_n(\mathrm{d}x)}\xrightarrow{P}0 \text{ as } n\to\infty.\end{aligned}$$

The rest follows analogous to the proof of the first statement. □

Proof of Corollary 4. It is $\lim_{n\to\infty}c_{n;1-\alpha}=c_{1-\alpha}$, where $c_{1-\alpha}$ is the $(1-\alpha)$-Quantile of $\sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m}|U(x)|$, or $\lim_{n\to\infty}d_{n;1-\alpha}=d_{1-\alpha}$, where $d_{1-\alpha}$ is the $(1-\alpha)$-Quantile of $\int U^2(x)G(\mathrm{d}x)$, see the Proof of Corollary 3. Thus, Theorem 3 implies

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{n\to\infty}P(\mathrm{KS}_n\geqslant c_{n;1-\alpha})\\ =&\lim_{n\to\infty}P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\mathrm{KS}_n\geqslant\sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m}|F(x)-G(x)|-\sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m}|F(x)-G(x)|+\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}c_{n;1-\alpha}\right)=1,\end{aligned}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{n\to\infty}P(\mathrm{CvM}_n\geqslant d_{n;1-\alpha})\\ =&\lim_{n\to\infty}P\left(\frac{1}{n}\mathrm{CvM}_n\geqslant\int\big(F(x)-G(x)\big)^2G(\mathrm{d}x)-\int\big(F(x)-G(x)\big)^2G(\mathrm{d}x)+\frac{1}{n}d_{n;1-\alpha}\right)\\ =&1,\end{aligned}$$

i.e., the statement. □

Lemma 4. *Assume (C1) and (C2). Then, for all sequences of parameters $(\vartheta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $\vartheta_n\in\Theta$ for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty}\vartheta_n=\vartheta$,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m}|G_n(x,\vartheta_n)-G(x,\vartheta)|=0.$$

Proof of Lemma 4. The statement follows with (C1), (C2), Taylor expansion and triangle inequality. □

Proof of Lemma 2. Consider n sufficiently large. The first statement will be shown firstly. For arbitrary $a\in\mathbb{R}^d\backslash\{0\}$, (C4) implies

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}n\sum_{i=1}^n\alpha_{i,n}^2\mathrm{Var}\left(a'\Big(\ell_n(X_i,\vartheta)-\int\ell_n(x,\vartheta)F_i(\mathrm{d}x)\Big)\right)=a'\kappa v(\vartheta)a.$$

For simplicity, assume in the following calculation without loss of generality $\int \ell_n(x,\vartheta)F_i(\mathrm{d}x) = 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Put $s_n^2 := n\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}^2 \mathrm{Var}(a'\ell_n(X_i,\vartheta))$ and assume without loss of generality $\lim_{n\to\infty} s_n^2 > 0$. (C4) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\forall t>0: \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{s_n^2}n\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}^2 \mathrm{E}\Big(|a'\ell_n(X_i,\vartheta)|^2 \mathrm{I}\Big(\sqrt{n}\alpha_{i,n}|a'\ell_n(X_i,\vartheta)| > \sqrt{s_n^2 t}\Big)\Big)\\ \leqslant \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{s_n^2}n\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}^2 \int a'\ell_n(x,\vartheta)\ell_n'(x,\vartheta)a\\ \mathrm{I}\big((\sqrt{n}\max_{1\leqslant j\leqslant n}\alpha_{j,n})^2 a'\ell_n(x,\vartheta)\ell_n'(x,\vartheta)a > s_n^2 t^2\big)F_i(\mathrm{d}x) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

For that reason, the triangular array of row-wise independent random variables $\sqrt{n}\alpha_{1,n}a'\ell_n(X_1,\vartheta),\ldots,\sqrt{n}\alpha_{n,n}a'\ell_n(X_n,\vartheta)$ fulfills Lindeberg's condition and from Cramér-Wold device, $\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\ell_n(X_i,\vartheta)$ converges in distribution to a centered d-dimensional normal distribution as $n\to\infty$. For the second statement, (C3), the first statement and Slutsky's theorem imply

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\vartheta}_n - \vartheta &= \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\ell_n(X_i,\vartheta) - \int \ell_n(x,\vartheta)\mathbb{F}_n(\mathrm{d}x) + o_p(1)\\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\Big(\ell_n(X_i,\vartheta) - \int \ell_n(x,\vartheta)F_i(\mathrm{d}x)\Big) + o_p(1) \xrightarrow{P} 0 \text{ as } n\to\infty,\end{aligned}$$

i.e., the statement. □

Lemma 5. *Put*

$$W_{i,n}(y,\vartheta) := \sqrt{n}\alpha_{i,n}\Big(\mathrm{I}(X_i\leqslant y) - F_i(y) - g'(y,\vartheta)\Big(\ell_n(X_i,\vartheta) - \int \ell_n(z,\vartheta)F_i(\mathrm{d}z)\Big)\Big), \tag{6.1}$$

$y\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m,\ i\in\mathbb{N}$.

Assume $\mathbb{F}_n = G_n(\cdot,\vartheta)$ for n sufficiently large and (C1) - (C4). Then, for all $p\in\mathbb{N}$, $x\in\times_{i=1}^p\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$, $x=(x_1,\ldots,x_p)$, and all $a\in\mathbb{R}^p$, $a=(a_1,\ldots,a_p)'$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|a'\begin{pmatrix}W_{i,n}(x_1,\vartheta)\\ \vdots\\ W_{i,n}(x_p,\vartheta)\end{pmatrix}\right|^2 \leqslant 2n\alpha_{i,n}^2|a|_1^2 + 2n\alpha_{i,n}^2 b'(x,a)\Big(\ell_n(X_i,\vartheta) - \int \ell_n(z,\vartheta)F_i(\mathrm{d}z)\Big)\\ \Big(\ell_n(X_i,\vartheta) - \int \ell_n(z,\vartheta)F_i(\mathrm{d}z)\Big)' b(x,a),\ i\in\mathbb{N},\end{aligned}$$

with $|a|_1 := |a_1| + \cdots + |a_p|$ and

$$b(x,a) := \begin{pmatrix}a_1 g_1(x_1,\vartheta) + \cdots + a_p g_1(x_p,\vartheta)\\ \vdots\\ a_1 g_d(x_1,\vartheta) + \cdots + a_p g_d(x_p,\vartheta)\end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof of Lemma 5. Define

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{W}_{i,n}(y,\vartheta) &:= \sqrt{n}\alpha_{i,n}\big(\mathrm{I}(X_i\leqslant y) - F_i(y)\big),\\ \overline{W}_{i,n}(y,\vartheta) &:= -\sqrt{n}\alpha_{i,n}g'(y,\vartheta)\Big(\ell_n(X_i,\vartheta) - \int \ell_n(z,\vartheta)F_i(\mathrm{d}z)\Big),\ y\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m,\ i\in\mathbb{N}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $W_{i,n}(y,\vartheta) = \underline{W}_{i,n}(y,\vartheta) + \overline{W}_{i,n}(y,\vartheta)$. Using triangle inequality,

$$\left| a' \begin{pmatrix} W_{i,n}(x_1,\vartheta) \\ \vdots \\ W_{i,n}(x_p,\vartheta) \end{pmatrix} \right|^2 = \left| a' \begin{pmatrix} \underline{W}_{i,n}(x_1,\vartheta) \\ \vdots \\ \underline{W}_{i,n}(x_p,\vartheta) \end{pmatrix} + a' \begin{pmatrix} \overline{W}_{i,n}(x_1,\vartheta) \\ \vdots \\ \overline{W}_{i,n}(x_p,\vartheta) \end{pmatrix} \right|^2$$
$$\leqslant \left(\sqrt{n}\alpha_{i,n}|a|_1 + \left| a' \begin{pmatrix} \overline{W}_{i,n}(x_1,\vartheta) \\ \vdots \\ \overline{W}_{i,n}(x_p,\vartheta) \end{pmatrix} \right| \right)^2 .$$

Furthermore, with a simple calculation,

$$a' \begin{pmatrix} \overline{W}_{i,n}(x_1,\vartheta) \\ \vdots \\ \overline{W}_{i,n}(x_p,\vartheta) \end{pmatrix} = -\sqrt{n}\alpha_{i,n} b'(x,a) \Big(\ell_n(X_i,\vartheta) - \int \ell_n(z,\vartheta) F_i(\mathrm{d}z) \Big), \ i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Finally, the inequality $(y+z)^2 \leqslant 2y^2 + 2z^2$, $y, z \in \mathbb{R}$, yields the statement. □

Proof of Theorem 4. Consider n sufficiently large. From Lemma 2, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \hat{\vartheta}_n = \vartheta$ in probability. Therefore, assume without loss of generality that $\hat{\vartheta}_n$ has realizations in U_ϑ , with a set U_ϑ given by (C1). Using Taylor expansion,

$$G_n(x,\hat{\vartheta}_n) = G_n(x,\vartheta) + g_n'(x,\overline{\vartheta}_{x,n})(\hat{\vartheta}_n - \vartheta), \ x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m,$$

where $\overline{\vartheta}_{x,n}$ is on the line between $\hat{\vartheta}_n$ and ϑ. Using this and $\mathbb{F}_n = \mathbb{G}_n(\cdot,\vartheta)$,

$$\begin{aligned} U_n(x,\hat{\vartheta}_n) =& \sqrt{n}\big(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x) - \mathbb{F}_n(x)\big) - g'(x,\vartheta)\sqrt{n}(\hat{\vartheta}_n - \vartheta) \\ &+ \big(g'(x,\vartheta) - g_n'(x,\overline{\vartheta}_{x,n})\big)\sqrt{n}(\hat{\vartheta}_n - \vartheta), \ x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m. \end{aligned}$$

Because of (C3), this is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} U_n(x,\hat{\vartheta}_n) =& \sqrt{n}\big(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x) - \mathbb{F}_n(x)\big) - g'(x,\vartheta)\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\Big(\ell_n(X_i,\vartheta) - \int \ell_n(y,\vartheta)F_i(\mathrm{d}y)\Big) \\ &+ \big(g'(x,\vartheta) - g_n'(x,\overline{\vartheta}_{x,n})\big)\sqrt{n}(\hat{\vartheta}_n - \vartheta) - g'(x,\vartheta)o_p(1), \ x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m. \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, assume without loss of generality $\int \ell_n(y,\vartheta)F_i(\mathrm{d}y) = 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Using (C2), Lemma 2 and Slutsky's Theorem,

$$\sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} \big|\big(g'(x,\vartheta) - g_n'(x,\overline{\vartheta}_{x,n})\big)\sqrt{n}(\hat{\vartheta}_n - \vartheta) - g'(x,\vartheta)o_p(1)\big| \xrightarrow{P} 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Because of Slutsky's theorem, Example 1.4.7 in [35], it is sufficient to show the convergence statement for the process defined by

$$V_n(x,\vartheta) := \sqrt{n}\big(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x) - \mathbb{F}_n(x)\big) - g'(x,\vartheta)\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\ell_n(X_i,\vartheta), \ x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m.$$

The process defined by $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x) - \mathbb{F}_n(x))$, $x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$, is asymptotically equicontinuous with respect to the metric space $(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m, \rho)$, see Lemma 1. In addition, from (C2) and Lemma 2, the process defined by $g'(x,\vartheta)\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\ell_n(X_i,\vartheta)$, $x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$, is asymptotically equicontinuous with respect to the metric space $(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m, \rho)$, too. Finally, the process $(V_n(x,\vartheta); x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ is asymptotically equicontinuous with respect to the metric space $(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m, \rho)$. Consider $W_{i,n}(\cdot,\vartheta)$ defined in (6.1), $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus,

$$V_n(y,\vartheta) = \sum_{i=1}^n W_{i,n}(y,\vartheta), \ y \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m.$$

For arbitrary $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \in \times_{i=1}^{p} \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$, $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_p)$, and arbitrary $a \in \mathbb{R}^p \backslash \{0\}$, put

$$s_n^2 := \sum_{i=1}^{n} \operatorname{Var}\left(a' \begin{pmatrix} W_{i,n}(x_1, \vartheta) \\ \vdots \\ W_{i,n}(x_p, \vartheta) \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

With $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_p)'$, (C4) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n\to\infty} s_n^2 = \sum_{1 \leqslant j,k \leqslant p} a_j a_k \kappa \Big(& G\big(\min(x_j, x_k), \vartheta\big) - G(x_j, \vartheta)\mathbb{G}(x_k, \vartheta) \\ & - g'(x_j, \vartheta) w(x_k, \vartheta) - g'(x_k, \vartheta) w(x_j, \vartheta) + g'(x_j, \vartheta) v(\vartheta) g(x_k, \vartheta) \Big). \end{aligned}$$

Assume without loss of generality $\lim_{n\to\infty} s_n^2 > 0$. With $b(x, a)$ and $|a|_1$ defined in Lemma 5, Lemma 5 and (C4) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \forall t > 0 : & \frac{1}{s_n^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{E}\left(\left| a' \begin{pmatrix} W_{i,n}(x_1, \vartheta) \\ \vdots \\ W_{i,n}(x_p, \vartheta) \end{pmatrix} \right|^2 \mathrm{I}\left(\left| a' \begin{pmatrix} W_{i,n}(x_1, \vartheta) \\ \vdots \\ W_{i,n}(x_p, \vartheta) \end{pmatrix} \right| > \sqrt{s_n^2 t} \right) \right) \\ & \leqslant \frac{2}{s_n^2} |a|_1^2 n \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_{i,n}^2 \int \mathrm{I}\Big((\sqrt{n} \max_{1 \leqslant j \leqslant n} \alpha_{j,n})^2 b'(x, a) \ell_n(y, \vartheta) \\ & \ell_n'(y, \vartheta) b(x, a) > s_n^2 \frac{t^2}{2} - (\sqrt{n} \max_{1 \leqslant j \leqslant n} \alpha_{j,n})^2 |a|_1^2 \Big) F_i(\mathrm{d}y) \\ & + \frac{2}{s_n^2} n \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_{i,n}^2 \int b'(x, a) \ell_n(y, \vartheta) \ell_n'(y, \vartheta) b(x, a) \\ & \mathrm{I}\Big((\sqrt{n} \max_{1 \leqslant j \leqslant n} \alpha_{j,n})^2 b'(x, a) \ell_n(y, \vartheta) \\ & \ell_n'(y, \vartheta) b(x, a) > s_n^2 \frac{t^2}{2} - (\sqrt{n} \max_{1 \leqslant j \leqslant n} \alpha_{j,n})^2 |a|_1^2 \Big) F_i(\mathrm{d}y) \longrightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty. \end{aligned}$$

For that reason, Lindeberg's condition is fulfilled and from Cramér-Wold device, the convergence of the finite dimensional marginal distributions of the process $(V_n(x, \vartheta); x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ to centered multivariate normal distributions follows. Finally, (C4) yields

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \operatorname{Cov}\big(V_n(x, \vartheta), V_n(y, \vartheta)\big) = c(x, y, \vartheta), \ x, y \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m,$$

and the statement follows from Theorem 1.5.4 in [35]. □

Proof of Corollary 5. With Theorem 4, Lemma 2 and Lemma 4 analogous to the Proof of Corollary 1. □

Proof of Lemma 3. This follows analogous to the Proof of Lemma 2. □

Lemma 6. *Put*

$$Z_{i,n}(y, \tilde{\vartheta}) := \sqrt{n} \alpha_{i,n} \left(\mathrm{I}(X_i^{(n)} \leqslant y) - \mathbb{G}_n(y, \tilde{\vartheta}) - g'(y, \vartheta) \ell_n(X_i^{(n)}, \tilde{\vartheta}) \right), \ (y, \tilde{\vartheta}) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m \times U_\vartheta, \ i \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{6.2}$$

Assume (C1), (C2), (C5) and (C6). Then, for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \in \times_{i=1}^{p} \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$, $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_p)$, and all $a \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_p)'$,

$$\left| a' \begin{pmatrix} Z_{i,n}(x_1, \tilde{\vartheta}) \\ \vdots \\ Z_{i,n}(x_p, \tilde{\vartheta}) \end{pmatrix} \right|^2 \leqslant 2n\alpha_{i,n}^2 |a|_1^2 + 2n\alpha_{i,n}^2 b'(x, a) \ell_n(X_i^{(n)}, \tilde{\vartheta}) \ell_n'(X_i^{(n)}, \tilde{\vartheta}) b(x, a), \ \tilde{\vartheta} \in U_\vartheta, \ i \in \mathbb{N},$$

with $b(x, a)$ and $|a|_1$ defined in Lemma 5.

Proof of Lemma 6. The proof is analogous to the Proof of Lemma 5. □

Proof of Theorem 5. Consider n sufficiently large. From Lemma 3, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \hat{\vartheta}_n^{(n)} = \vartheta$ in probability. Therefore, assume without loss of generality that $\hat{\vartheta}_n^{(n)}$ has realizations in U_ϑ and $\vartheta_n \in U_\vartheta$, with a set U_ϑ given by (C1). Put

$$\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n^{(n)}(x) := \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n} \mathrm{I}(X_i^{(n)} \leqslant x),\ x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m.$$

Using Taylor expansion,

$$G_n(x, \hat{\vartheta}_n^{(n)}) = G_n(x, \vartheta_n) + g_n'(x, \overline{\vartheta}_{x,n})(\hat{\vartheta}_n^{(n)} - \vartheta_n),\ x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m,$$

where $\overline{\vartheta}_{x,n}$ is on the line between $\hat{\vartheta}_n^{(n)}$ and ϑ_n. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} U_n(x, \hat{\vartheta}_n^{(n)}) &= \sqrt{n}\big(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n^{(n)}(x) - G_n(x, \vartheta_n)\big) - g'(x, \vartheta)\sqrt{n}(\hat{\vartheta}_n^{(n)} - \vartheta_n) \\ &+ \big(g'(x, \vartheta) - g_n'(x, \overline{\vartheta}_{x,n})\big)\sqrt{n}(\hat{\vartheta}_n^{(n)} - \vartheta_n),\ x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m. \end{aligned}$$

Using (C5), this is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} U_n(x, \hat{\vartheta}_n) =& \sqrt{n}\big(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n^{(n)}(x) - G_n(x, \vartheta_n)\big) - g'(x, \vartheta)\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\ell_n(X_i^{(n)}, \vartheta_n) \\ &+ \big(g'(x, \vartheta) - g_n'(x, \overline{\vartheta}_{x,n})\big)\sqrt{n}(\hat{\vartheta}_n^{(n)} - \vartheta_n) - g'(x, \vartheta)o_p(1),\ x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m. \end{aligned}$$

(C2), Lemma 3 and Slutsky's Theorem yield

$$\sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m} \big|\big(g'(x, \vartheta) - g_n'(x, \overline{\vartheta}_{x,n})\big)\sqrt{n}(\hat{\vartheta}_n^{(n)} - \vartheta_n) - g'(x, \vartheta)o_p(1)\big| \xrightarrow{P} 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Because of Slutsky's theorem, it is sufficient to show the convergence statement for the process defined by

$$V_n^{(n)}(x, \vartheta_n) := \sqrt{n}\big(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n^{(n)}(x) - G_n(x, \vartheta_n)\big) - g'(x, \vartheta)\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\ell_n(X_i^{(n)}, \vartheta_n),\ x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m.$$

Because $\lim_{n\to\infty} G(\cdot, \vartheta_n) = G(\cdot, \vartheta)$ uniformly on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$, the process defined by $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n^{(n)}(x) - G_n(x, \vartheta_n))$, $x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$, is asymptotically equicontinuous with respect to the metric space $(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m, \rho)$, see Lemma 1. In addition, from (C2) and Lemma 3, the process defined by $g'(x, \vartheta)\sqrt{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}\ell_n(X_i^{(n)}, \vartheta_n)$, $x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$, is asymptotically equicontinuous with respect to the metric space $(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m, \rho)$, too. Finally, the process $(V_n^{(n)}(x, \vartheta_n); x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ is asymptotically equicontinuous with respect to the metric space $(\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m, \rho)$. Consider $Z_{i,n}$ defined in (6.2), $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus,

$$V_n^{(n)}(y, \vartheta_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n Z_{i,n}(y, \vartheta_n),\ y \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m.$$

For arbitrary $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \in \times_{i=1}^p \overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$, $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_p)$, and arbitrary $a \in \mathbb{R}^p \backslash \{0\}$, put

$$s_n^2 := \sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{Var}\left(a' \begin{pmatrix} Z_{i,n}(x_1, \vartheta_n) \\ \vdots \\ Z_{i,n}(x_p, \vartheta_n) \end{pmatrix}\right).$$

With $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_p)'$, (C6) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n\to\infty} s_n^2 = \sum_{1\leqslant j,k\leqslant p} a_j a_k \kappa\Big(& G\big(\min(x_j, x_k), \vartheta\big) - G(x_j, \vartheta)G(x_k, \vartheta) \\ & - g'(x_j, \vartheta)w^{()}(x_k, \vartheta) - g'(x_k, \vartheta)w^{()}(x_j, \vartheta) + g'(x_j, \vartheta)v^{()}(\vartheta)g(x_k, \vartheta)\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Assume without loss of generality $\lim_{n\to\infty} s_n^2 > 0$. With $b(x,a)$ and $|a|_1$ defined in Lemma 5, Lemma 6 and (C6) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\forall t>0: \ \frac{1}{s_n^2}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{E}\left(\left|a'\begin{pmatrix} Z_{i,n}(x_1,\vartheta_n)\\ \vdots \\ Z_{i,n}(x_p,\vartheta_n)\end{pmatrix}\right|^2 \mathrm{I}\left(\left|a'\begin{pmatrix} Z_{i,n}(x_1,\vartheta_n)\\ \vdots \\ Z_{i,n}(x_p,\vartheta_n)\end{pmatrix}\right| > \sqrt{s_n^2}t\right)\right)\\
\leqslant \frac{2}{s_n^2}|a|_1^2 n\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}^2 \int \mathrm{I}\Big((\sqrt{n}\max_{1\leqslant j\leqslant n}\alpha_{j,n})^2 b'(x,a)\ell_n(y,\vartheta_n)\\
\ell_n'(y,\vartheta_n)b(x,a) > s_n^2\frac{t^2}{2} - (\sqrt{n}\max_{1\leqslant j\leqslant n}\alpha_{j,n})^2|a|_1^2\Big)G_n(\mathrm{d}y,\vartheta_n)\\
+\frac{2}{s_n^2}n\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,n}^2\int b'(x,a)\ell_n(y,\vartheta_n)\ell_n'(y,\vartheta_n)b(x,a)\\
\mathrm{I}\Big((\sqrt{n}\max_{1\leqslant j\leqslant n}\alpha_{j,n})^2 b'(x,a)\ell_n(y,\vartheta_n)\\
\ell_n'(y,\vartheta_n)b(x,a) > s_n^2\frac{t^2}{2} - (\sqrt{n}\max_{1\leqslant j\leqslant n}\alpha_{j,n})^2|a|_1^2\Big)G_n(\mathrm{d}y,\vartheta_n) \longrightarrow 0 \text{ as } n\to\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

For that reason, Lindeberg's condition is fulfilled and from Cramér-Wold device, the convergence of the finite dimensional marginal distributions of the process $(V_n^{(n)}(x,\vartheta_n); x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ to centered multivariate normal distributions follows. Finally, Lemma 4 and (C6) yields

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathrm{Cov}\big(V_n^{(n)}(x,\vartheta_n), V_n^{(n)}(y,\vartheta_n)\big) = c^{()}(x,y,\vartheta),\ \ x,y\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m,$$

and the statement follows from Theorem 1.5.4 in [35]. □

Proof of Corollary 6. With Theorem 5, Lemma 4 and Lemma 3 analogous to the Proof of Corollary 1. □

Proof of Corollary 7. Because the restriction of the covariance function (3.6) to the diagonal of $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m\times\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$ does not vanish everywhere or $G(\cdot,\vartheta)$-almost everywhere, the distribution function of $\sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m}|U(x,\vartheta)|$ or $\int U^2(x,\vartheta)G(\mathrm{d}x,\vartheta)$ is strictly increasing on the non-negative half-line. In addition, the assumptions yield that the covariance functions (3.6) and (3.8) coincide. For that reason, $\lim_{n\to\infty} c_{n;1-\alpha} = c_{1-\alpha}$ in probability, where $c_{1-\alpha}$ is the $(1-\alpha)$-Quantile of $\sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m}|U(x,\vartheta)|$, or $\lim_{n\to\infty} d_{n;1-\alpha} = d_{1-\alpha}$ in probability, where $d_{1-\alpha}$ is the $(1-\alpha)$-Quantile of $\int U^2(x,\vartheta)G(\mathrm{d}x,\vartheta)$, see Corollary 6 and Lemma 2. The statement follows from Corollary 5. □

Proof of Theorem 6. This follows with arguments similar to the arguments in the Proof of Theorem 3 by using Lemma 4 and (C7). □

Proof of Corollary 8. Because the restriction of the covariance function (3.8) to the diagonal of $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m\times\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$ does not vanish everywhere or $G(\cdot,\vartheta)$-almost everywhere, the distribution function of $\sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m}|U^{()}(x,\vartheta)|$ or $\int(U^{()}(x,\vartheta))^2G(\mathrm{d}x,\vartheta)$ is strictly increasing on the non-negative half-line. For that reason, $\lim_{n\to\infty} c_{n;1-\alpha} = c_{1-\alpha}$ in probability, where $c_{1-\alpha}$ is the $(1-\alpha)$-Quantile of $\sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m}|U^{()}(x,\vartheta)|$, or $\lim_{n\to\infty} d_{n;1-\alpha} = d_{1-\alpha}$ in probability, where $d_{1-\alpha}$ is the $(1-\alpha)$-Quantile of $\int(U^{()}(x,\vartheta))^2G(\mathrm{d}x,\vartheta)$, see Corollary 6 and regard (C7). With Theorem 6, the rest follows similar to the Proof of Corollary 4. □

Lemma 7. *It is*

$$\lim_{\min N\to\infty}\sup_{(x,v)\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m\times\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s}\left|\left|\big(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x),\hat{\mathbb{G}}_r(v)\big) - \big(F(x),G(v)\big)\right|\right| = 0 \text{ in probability.}$$

Proof of Lemma 7. Applying Corollary 1 yields the convergence in distribution of $\sqrt{n}\sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m}|\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x)-\mathbb{F}_n(x)|$ and $\sqrt{r}\sup_{v\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s}|\hat{\mathbb{G}}_r(v)-\mathbb{G}_r(v)|$. Then, from Slutsky's Theorem, $\sup_{x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m}|\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x)-F(x)|\xrightarrow{P}0$ as $n\to\infty$ as well as $\sup_{v\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s}|\hat{\mathbb{G}}_r(v)-G(v)|\xrightarrow{P}0$ as $r\to\infty$. □

Proof of Theorem 7. Consider n sufficiently large. Denote by $\mathbb{M}_{N,m}:=(M_{N,m}(x);x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ the process

$$M_{N,m}(x):=\sqrt[4]{nr}\big(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n(x)-\mathbb{F}_n(x)\big),\ x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m,$$

denote by $\mathbb{M}_{N,s}:=(M_{N,s}(v);v\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s)$ the process

$$M_{N,s}(v):=\sqrt[4]{nr}\big(\hat{\mathbb{G}}_r(v)-\mathbb{G}_r(v)\big),\ v\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s,$$

put $\mathbb{M}_N:=(\mathbb{M}_{N,m},\mathbb{M}_{N,s})$ and $M_N:=(M_{N,m},M_{N,s})$. Thus, $M_N=\sqrt[4]{nr}((\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n,\hat{\mathbb{G}}_r)-(\mathbb{F}_n,\mathbb{G}_r))$. Because the processes $\mathbb{M}_{N,m}$ and $\mathbb{M}_{N,s}$ are independent, Theorem 1 and (4.1) yield the convergence in distribution

$$\mathbb{M}_N\xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}}\mathbb{M}\text{ as }\min N\to\infty$$

on the related product space, see [35]. $T(\mathbb{F}_n,\mathbb{G}_r)=Q(\mathbb{F}_n,\mathbb{G}_r)$ and the continuity of T and Q imply $T(F,G)=Q(F,G)$ and therefore $J=j(F,G)=(F,G)$. Regarding Theorem 1.10.4 in [35], one can assume a.s. $\lim_{\min N\to\infty}\mathbb{M}_N=\mathbb{M}$ uniformly on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m\times\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s$ without loss of generality. Because $T(\mathbb{F}_n,\mathbb{G}_r)=Q(\mathbb{F}_n,\mathbb{G}_r)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{U}_N=&\sqrt[4]{nr}\left(T\left((\mathbb{F}_n,\mathbb{G}_r)+\frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{nr}}M_N\right)-T(\mathbb{F}_n,\mathbb{G}_r)\right)-\mathrm{d}T(F,G)(M)\\&-\left(\sqrt[4]{nr}\left(Q\left((\mathbb{F}_n,\mathbb{G}_r)+\frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{nr}}M_N\right)-Q(\mathbb{F}_n,\mathbb{G}_r)\right)-\mathrm{d}Q(F,G)(M)\right)\\&+\mathrm{d}T(F,G)(M)-\mathrm{d}Q(F,G)(M).\end{aligned}$$

The assumtions on T and Q yield a.s. $\lim_{\min N\to\infty}\mathbb{U}_N=\mathbb{U}$ uniformly on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^u$. □

Proof of Corollary 9. The continuity of T and j and Lemma 7 imply

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{z\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^u}|T(\hat{\mathbb{J}}_N)(z)-T(J)(z)|=0\text{ in probability.}$$

Theorem 7 yields $J=(F,G)$. The rest follows with Theorem 7 analogous to the Proof of Corollary 1. □

Proof of Theorem 8. Put

$$\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n^{(N)}(x):=\sum_{i=1}^n\alpha_{i,n}\mathrm{I}(X_i^{(N)}\leqslant x),\ x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m,\tag{6.3}$$

as well as

$$\hat{\mathbb{G}}_r^{(N)}(v):=\sum_{i=1}^r\beta_{i,r}\mathrm{I}(V_i^{(N)}\leqslant v),\ v\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s,\tag{6.4}$$

and $\hat{\mathbb{J}}_N^{(N)}:=j(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n^{(N)},\hat{\mathbb{G}}_r^{(N)})$. Denote by $\mathbb{M}_{N,m}^{(N)}:=(M_{N,m}^{(N)}(x);x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m)$ the process

$$M_{N,m}^{(N)}(x):=\sqrt[4]{nr}\big(\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n^{(N)}(x)-J_{N,m}(x)\big),\ x\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m,$$

by $\mathbb{M}_{N,s}^{(N)}:=(M_{N,s}^{(N)}(v);v\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s)$ the process

$$M_{N,s}^{(N)}(v):=\sqrt[4]{nr}\big(\hat{\mathbb{G}}_r^{(N)}(v)-J_{N,s}(v)\big),\ v\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s,$$

put $\mathbb{M}_N^{(N)} := (\mathbb{M}_{N,m}^{(N)}, \mathbb{M}_{N,s}^{(N)})$ and $M_N^{(N)} := (M_{N,m}^{(N)}, M_{N,s}^{(N)})$. Thus, $M_N^{(N)} = \sqrt[4]{nr}((\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n^{(N)}, \hat{\mathbb{G}}_r^{(N)}) - J_N)$. The processes $\mathbb{M}_{N,m}^{(N)}$ and $\mathbb{M}_{N,s}^{(N)}$ based on triangular arrays of row-wise independent and identically distributed random vectors. The asymptotic of this processes can be treated similar to the approach related to Theorem 1 without any additional conditions by using $\lim_{\min N\to\infty} J_{N,m} = J_m$ uniformly on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$ and $\lim_{\min N\to\infty} J_{N,s} = J_s$ uniformly on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s$, the uniformly continuity of J_m and J_s and (4.1). Because the processes $\mathbb{M}_{N,m}^{(N)}$ and $\mathbb{M}_{N,s}^{(N)}$ are independent, it follows that

$$\mathbb{M}_N^{(N)} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{d}} \mathbb{M} \text{ as } \min N \to \infty$$

on the related product space. Again, one can assume a.s. $\lim_{\min N\to\infty} \mathbb{M}_N^{(N)} = \mathbb{M}$ uniformly on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m \times \overline{\mathbb{R}}^s$ without loss of generality. Because $T(J_N) = Q(J_N)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{U}_N^{(N)} =& \sqrt[4]{nr}\left(T\left(J_N + \frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{nr}} M_N^{(N)}\right) - T(J_N)\right) - \mathrm{d}T(J)(M) \\ &- \left(\sqrt[4]{nr}\left(Q\left(J_N + \frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{nr}} M_N^{(N)}\right) - Q(J_N)\right) - \mathrm{d}Q(J)(M)\right) \\ &+ \mathrm{d}T(J)(M) - \mathrm{d}Q(J)(M).\end{aligned}$$

The assumtions on T, Q and J_N yield a.s. $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{U}_N^{(N)} = \mathbb{U}$ uniformly on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^u$ and the statement follows. □

Proof of Corollary 10. The asymptotic of $\hat{\mathbb{F}}_n^{(N)}$ and $\hat{\mathbb{G}}_r^{(N)}$ defined in (6.3) and (6.4) can be treated similar to the approach related to Corollary 1 and Lemma 7 without any additional conditions by using $\lim_{\min N\to\infty} J_{N,m} = J_m$ uniformly on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^m$, $\lim_{\min N\to\infty} J_{N,s} = J_s$ uniformly on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^s$ and the uniformly continuity of J_m and J_s. The continuity of T and j yield

$$\lim_{\min N\to\infty} \sup_{z\in\overline{\mathbb{R}}^u} |T(\hat{\mathbb{J}}_N^{(N)})(z) - T(J)(z)| = 0 \text{ in probability,}$$

where $\hat{\mathbb{J}}_N^{(N)}$ is defined in the Proof of Theorem 8. The rest follows with Theorem 8 analogous to the Proof of Corollary 1. □

Proof of Corollary 11. The proof is analogous to the Proof of Corollary 7 by applying Corollary 9, Corollary 10, Lemma 7 and the continuity of j. Regard that $J = (F, G)$, see Theorem 7. □

Proof of Theorem 9. This follows with arguments similar to the arguments in the Proof of Theorem 3 by using Lemma 7 and the continuity of T, Q and j. □

Proof of Corollary 12. The proof is analogous to the Proof of Corollary 8 by applying Corollary 10, Lemma 7, the continuity of j and Theorem 9. □

References

[1] Alexander, K. S. (1987). The Central Limit Theorem for Weighted Empirical Processes Indexed by Sets. J. Multivariate Anal. 22, 313-339.

[2] Anderson, T. W., Darling, D. A. (1952). Asymptotic Theory of Certain "Goodness of Fit" Criteria Based on Stochastic Processes. Ann. Math. Statist. 23, 193–212.

[3] Andrews, D. W. K. (1997). A Conditional Kolmogorov Test. Econometrica 65, 1097–1128.

[4] Baringhaus, L., Gaigall, D. (2015). On an independence test approach to the goodness-of-fit problem. J. Multivariate Anal. 140, 193–208.

[5] Blum, J. R., Kiefer, J., Rosenblatt, M. (1961). Distribution Free Tests of Independence Based on the Sample Distribution Function. Ann. Math. Statist. 32, 485–498.

[6] Butler, C. C. (1969). A Test for Symmetry Using the Sample Distribution Function. Ann. Math. Statist. 40, 2209–2210. 25, 287–299.

[7] Chatterjee, S. K., Sen, P. K. (1973). On Kolmogorov-Smirnov-type tests for symmetry. Ann. Inst. Statist. Math. 25, 287–299.

[8] Chicheportiche, R., Bouchaud, J. (2011). Goodness-of-fit tests with dependent observations. J. Stat. Mech. 9, P09003.

[9] Collings, B. J., Margolin, B. H. (1985). Testing Goodness of Fit for the Poisson Assumption When Observations Are Not Identically Distributed. J. Amer. Statist. Ass. 80, 411–418.

[10] Conover, W. J., Cox, D. D., Martz, H. F. (1997). A chi-square goodness-of-fit test for non-identically distributed random variables: with application to empirical Bayes. IAEA/INIS 30, LA-UR–97-4825.

[11] Delaigle, A., Meister, A. (2008). Density estimation with heteroscedastic error. Bernoulli 14, No. 2, 562–579.

[12] Dudley, R. M. (1984). A course on empirical processes. Lecture Notes in Math. 1097, 1–142. Springer, New York.

[13] Eicker, F. (1967). Limit theorems for regressions with unequal and dependent errors. Proc. Fifth Berkeley Symp. on Math. Statist. and Prob., Vol. 1 (Univ. of Calif. Press, 1967), 59–82.

[14] Görnitz, N, Porbadnigk, A., Binder, A., Sannelli, C., Braun, M., Müller, K., Kloft, M. (2014). Learning and evaluation in presence of non-iid label noise. AISTATS 2014, 293–302.

[15] Ghosh, A., Basu, A. (2015). Robust Bounded Influence Tests for Independent Non-Homogeneous Observations. ArXiv:1502.01106.

[16] Hu, F., Zidek, J. V. (2002). The Weighted Likelihood. Can. J. of Statist. Vol. 30, 347–371.

[17] Hüsler, J. (1987). Test Based on Independent, but Non-identically Distributed Random Variables. Biometrical J. 29, 423–428.

[18] Kosorok, M. C. A. (2003). Bootstraps of sums of independent but not identically distributed stochastic processes. J. Multivariate Anal. 84, 299–318.

[19] Kosorok, M. C. A. (2008). Introduction to Empirical Processes and Semiparametric Inference. Springer, New York.

[20] Kuljus, K., Zwanzig, S. (2013). Asymptotic properties of a rank estimate in linear regression with symmetric non-identically distributed errors. Statistics: A Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics 47, 1160–1183.

[21] Lu, J., Yang, W., Wang, J., Li, B., Dou, W. (2013). An independent but not identically distributed bit error model for heavy-tailed wireless channels. Journal of Zhejiang University SCIENCE C 14, 42–29.

[22] Müller-Funk, U., Witting, H. (1995). Mathematische Statistik II - Asymptotische Statistik: Parametrische Modelle und nicht-parametrische Funktionale. Teubner, Leipzig.

[23] Pollard, D. (1990). Empirical Processes: Theory and Applications. NSF-CBMS Regional Conference Series in Probability and Statistics 2.

[24] Ren, J., Sen, P. K. (1991). On hadamard differentiability of extended statistical functional. J. Multivariate Anal. 39, 30–43.

[25] Ren, J., Sen, P. K. (1995). Hadamard Differentiability on $D[0,1]^p$. J. Multivariate Anal. 55, 14–28.

[26] Ren, J., Sen, P. K. (2001). Second Order Hadamard Differentiability in Statistical Applications. J. Multivariate Anal. 77, 187–228.

[27] Rosenblatt, M. (1952). Limit Theorems Associated with Variants of the Von Mises Statistic. Ann. Math. Statist. 23, 617–623.

[28] Sarkadi, K. (1967). On testing for normality. Berkeley Symp. on Math. Statist. and Prob. Proc. Fifth Berkeley Symp. on Math. Statist. and Prob. 1 (Univ. of Calif. Press), 373–387.

[29] Serfling, R. (2006). Multivariate symmetry and asymmetry. In Encyclopedia of Statistical Sciences, 2nd Ed. (Kotz, Balakrishnan, Read and Vidakovic eds.). Wiley, New York, 5338–5345.

[30] Shapiro, A. (1990). On concepts of directional differentiability. J. of Optimization Theory and Appl. 66, 477–487.

[31] Shorack, G. R. (1979). The weighted empirical process of row independent random variables with arbitrary distribution functions. Statistica Neerlandica 33, 169–229.

[32] Shorack, G. R., Wellner, J. A. (2009). Empirical Processes with Applications to Statistics. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.

[33] Stute, W.,Manteiga, W. G., Quindimil, M. P. (1993). Bootstrap based goodness-of-fit-tests. Metrika 40, 243–256.

[34] van der Vaart (1991). Efficiency and Hadamard Differentiability. Scand. J. of Statist. 18, 63–75.

[35] van der Vaart, A., Wellner, J. A. (1996). Weak convergence and empirical processes. Springer, New York.

[36] v. Mises, R. (1947). On the Asymptotic Distribution of Differentiable Statistical Functions. Ann. Math. Statist. 18, 309–348.

[37] Wang, X., van Eeden, C., Zidek, J. V. (2004). Asymptotic properties of maximum weighted likelihood estimators. J. of Statist. Planning and Inference 119, 37 -54.

[38] Wang, X., Zidek, J. V. (2005). Selecting likelihood weights by cross-validation. Ann. Statist. Vol. 33, 463–500.

[39] Weiss, M. S. (1978). Modification of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Statistic for Use with Correlated Data. J. Amer. Statist. Ass. 73, 872–875.

[40] Ziegler, K. (1997). Functional Central Limit Theorems for Triangular Arrays of Function-Indexed Processes under Uniformly Integrable Entropy Conditions. J. Multivariate Anal. 62, 233–272.